Truth Will o[illegible]

OR

A Discovery of some [illegible]

Smoothly told by

Dr. JEREMY TAYL[illegible]

In his

[illegible]SSWASIVE From POPE[illegible]

With an Answer to such Argument[illegible]

as deserve

ANSWER

By his Friendly Adversary E[illegible]

Ergo inimicus vobis factus sum verum [illegible]
Gal. 4. 16.

Printed [illegible]

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

THE EPISTLE To the READER.

WE ſay, all is not Gold that Gliſters, and that *Moſt worth* lyes not ever hid under a fair *Outſide*. A Comet ſeems ſometimes as glorious as a Star; a Parelion like the Sun; and Falſhood got under a handſome Viſard well trim'd up, may take with many and paſs Diſguiſed for current Truth: But ſuch ſlight Beauty beguiles not long. True Worth undoes it. The Suns laſting Glory, the Stars conſtant Brightneſs, enough Diſluſtres both Parelion and Comet: And *Truth*, though perhaps it may not here quite vanquiſh Falſhood (for Some will Defend it to the Worlds end) is able at leaſt to pull of it's Gaudy Viſard, and put it out of Countenance.

A World of this Counterfeit Luſtre, we have now a days in Books, ſet forth (as is pretended) to Beautifie the Heaven of Chriſtianity, and Enlighten *a People that ſit in Darkneſs*. One I have met with ('tis the Diſſwaſive from Popery) that Parelion-like in a Triple Cloud is (as I am told) Glorioufly out in three Editi-

ons; and lately appeared in the two Kingdoms of *England* and *Ireland*. More I believe have been Gazing on it then well diſcovered the faulty Luſtre: Real Worth I cannot mention; for what find we I beſeech you conſiderable in this Book, but a uſeleſs *Repetition* of old defeated Objections? which have now for a whole Age run through a few Vulgar worn-out Controverſies, and in Rigor require only a *Return* of the Old Anſwers given a hundred times by Catholick Writers: new Arguments, which one might have expected from ſo Great a Doctor, ſeldom appear. You have moreover, more then a few Miſtakes relating to Catholick Doctrine: Want enough of Divinity: A ſeeming Zeal, ('tis true) but ill ſeaſon'd with Jeers and harſher Language: Calumnies vented: *Talk* and no Proof. Here is, what I think, the Doctor muſt own, the Inſide and beſt ſubſtance of his Diſſwaſive.

The Flaſh therefore and fair Luſtre of his Book lies neither in the choice of Matter, nor manner of handling it; but in ſpecious *Quotations* that flouriſh in the Margents. Theſe ſet down in the enſuing Treatiſe, I have carefully examined; Read with my own Eyes in the Original Authors; (not one have I taken on truſt) and after a diligent ſearch muſt profeſs with all Candor; not one (worth notice) have I found, but 'tis either wholly impertinent to what he would Prove; or ſtrangely wreſted to a ſiniſter Sence; or not found at all in the Original (nor a Word like it:) Or finally, (which is moſt uſual and to be pitied in a Doctor) unpardonably corrupted. To inſiſt on every leſs valuable Authority, or on ſuch as ſhew themſelves *Profeſs* even Read in the Diſſwaſive, would be Time miſpent, and weary a Reader. Theſe I offer to your View, are of the groſſer Sort; and Numerous enough to *Evidence* that the Doctors

pre-

pretended *Faultleſs Book* is Proved Faulty; and no more powerful to Diſſwade from Popery, then Error is to draw men from Truth.

Far am I off from the Doctors Humour, in Judging this ſmall Treatiſe Faultleſs. I willingly acknowledge many Faults, but know not how to mend Them. One is, no little want of Engliſh; but this I hope dear Reader you will eaſily Pardon; I am ſure you would, did you but know how long I have been a Stranger to my Country. An other is, too tedious a length ſometimes in Latin Sentences: The Fault (if any) is unavoydable: For while the Charge is laid on ill Quotations, the Right ones muſt appear, and in their proper Terms. To give an Authors Meaning only, and Wave his Words ſeems *Forceleſs*: And in ſtead of laying Difficulties may Raiſe up more. Where it moſt Imports I have done my beſt to Engliſh the Latin faithfully, *Ad pedem literæ*: the Tranſlation therefore cannot but look Rugged; yet that is better, then to have the Genuine Sence miſcarry in ſmoother Language. Laſtly, a harſher Word may perhaps, through haſt or unawares, have caſually fallen from me; if ſo, I here unſay it, and Humbly crave Pardon: And were my Papers (now out of my reach) in my Hands again, I would in this Correct whatever might juſtly ſeem offenſive.

If Doctor *Taylor* ſhall pleaſe to warn me of greater Faults, I'll thank him for his Charity: And if he thinks it worth his Pains to take notice of my Exceptions againſt his Book, my earneſt Requeſt is, that he miſpend not Time in Trifles, nor weigh only leſſer Matters, while he hath greater charged on him that juſtly require Satisfaction. For Example: I have plainly tax'd him of wrong done to *Sixtus Senenſis*, to the *Expurgatory Index*, to *Petrus Lombardus*, *Otho Friſingenſis*, and others in the begin-

beginning of my Treatiſe; let him as plainly Purge himſelf in theſe Particulars, and ſhew me my Error: for moſt certainly I have either wronged him, or he theſe Authors. I preſs him afterward with undeniable Authorities of moſt Ancient Fathers, both for the Uſe and Worſhip of Holy Images. His expreſs Anſwer is herein required alſo, chiefly to St. *Baſil*, and St. *Iohn Damaſcen*. I have told him of his Forging ſtrange Doctrines, and *Fathering* them on *Tolet*, *Suarez*, *Bellarmin*, *Emanuel Sa*, and others: If he be injured he can Right himſelf, and ſhew where *Sa* affirms, *That if a man lies with his intended Wife before Marriage it is no ſin, or a light one.* Whether the true Sence of *Bellarmin* in his Quotation, pag. 167. be not wholly perverted, *If the Pope ſhould Err by Commanding*, &c. Theſe for an Eſſay only; more you will have, and of greater Concernment hereafter. May it pleaſe the Doctor to clear himſelf by a ſolid Anſwer, he'll hearten me to Reply: Or if he can produce againſt me but one Quotation ſo fowly amiſs as *that one* Charg'd on *Emanuel Sa* (to ſay nothing of many worſe) I do here profeſs a Readineſs, and will comply with it, to publiſh my Fault to the Whole World. O, would he Encourage himſelf to proceed with like Candor! and unſay only what his own Conſcience knows Faulty in his *Diſſwaſive*, he might be Eternally Glorious. And why ſhould I forbid my ſelf to hope for ſo Laudable a Retractation? Juſtice requires it: Conſcience forcibly preſſes: Truth, that ſuffers, ſtrongly Pleads for it: Chriſtian Humility eaſily ſubmits: And Gods Victorious Grace is now no leſs Powerful to do this Work on him, then once it was to Reclaim a Bleſſed St. *Auſtin*. *Quare Arripe obſecro te* (they are the Pious and well meant Words of this Saint, *Tom.* 2. *Epiſt.* 9. to a Great Doctor, and my Submiſſive Petition to Doctor *Taylor*.) *Arripe obſecro*

obſecro te; ingenuam, & vere Chriſtianam cum charitate ſeveritatem ad illud (tuum) *opus corrigendum, atque emandandum & παλινῳδίαν ut dicitur, cane: Incomparabiliter enim pulchrior eſt Veritas Chriſtianorum quam Helena Græcorum*, &c. Such I ſay is my Petition preſented to our Doctor: and if the Love of Truth bears ſway in his Breaſt, yeeld he needs muſt to a ſpeedy *retractation*. Nothing can Retard him from ſo generous a Reſolution, but either Motives of intereſt drawn from a *naughty* World; or his own once vented *αὐτὸς ἔφα*. So, (forſooth) he hath *ſaid* in his *Diſſwaſive*, and ſo it muſt ſtand: though all run to Ruin, and Chriſtianity ſuffers.

The Doctor I confeſs hath been moſt Unluckily in broaching Hereſies, and wanting Grace to retract them. Some years are now paſt ſince he was ſo Unfortunate as to become a Patron of the Pelagian Hereſie; when *ex profeſſo* he Writ a Book againſt Original ſin, and ſtoutly defended it: and being Friendly told by his own Brethren, that what he ſaid was not only oppoſite to Catholick Faith, but alſo to the very Doctrine of the Church of *England* expreſly deliver'd in her Liturgy, in 39. Articles, in the Office of Baptiſm, *&c.* He had yet the boldneſs to deny all, and aſſert that the Church of *England* held not Original Sin, though both Prince and Prelate knew then and believ'd the contrary. I know not that he ever yet Recanted this Hereſie; if not, 'tis now high Time to do it: and with it, to Weep for the Errors in his *Diſſwaſive*: if he fails in both Duties, the World will ſay (and ſay truly) that Dr. *Taylor* is *Notior peccans quam pœnitens*; more known for his Sin then for his Repentance; and may Prudently Judge that he of all others was the unfitteſt Man to Write againſt Popery that diſowns the Doctrine of his own Church: unleſs this makes him fit; that being a Pelagian, his Words (though

(though he multiplies Volums) will want weight againſt Catholicks: For this is my reflection (and I think a true one) that this man who dar'd to ſay that the Church of *England* holds not Original Sin, ſo plainly taught and believ'd by all; will not Boggle to miſcite the Fathers, remote from our knowledge, Read by few, and Underſtood by fewer.

Farewel Gentle Reader, with a thouſand well-wiſhes for thy profitting by this Treatiſe; I beſtow as many on Dr. *Taylor*, whoſe Enemy (God knows) I am not: Nor can he think me one, for laying out his Errors, and telling Truth: Upon this very Account he ought (and I hope will) to return me Thanks. If now I Merit none, I may hereafter have better Luck and deſerve them. If plain dealing may do it, he ſhall have Reaſon to account me, as indeed I am, his Faithful True SERVANT, and Friendly ADVERSARY.

E. W.

THE

QUOTATIONS

Faulty in

DOCTOR TAYLORS PREFACE

To the

READER.

TO deſtroy Tradition not contain'd in Scripture, the Doctor cites *Tertullian* thus, *I adore the fulneſs of Scripture, and if it be not written, let* Hermogenes *fear the wo that is deſtin'd to them that detract from, or add to it.* I anſwer, the Dr. turn's the true genuine ſence out of this whole ſentence, chiefly by theſe guileful particles of his own making: *And if it be not written,* which ſeem excluſive of all unwritten tradition; yet this Authority no more relates to Catholick Doctrine concerning Tradition, then a Fable in *Eſop.* Briefly therefore; *Tertullian,* diſputing againſt *Hermogenes* that held theſe viſible things were created of I know not what prejacent matter; ſpeaks thus: *Lib. adverſus Hermog. Antwerp* Print *cap.* 22. page 495. *In principio,* &c. *In the beginning God made heaven and Earth*: then adds; *Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem,* I adore the fulneſs of Scripture: Wherein? in what doth he adore this fulneſs? He anſwers, *Qua mihi & factorem manifeſtat & facta,* I adore the fulneſs of Scri-

 pture;

pture, that doth manifeſt to me both the Maker, and things made; As who ſhould ſay, in this particular the Scripture is compleat, and I adore its fulneſs, &c. Now theſe laſt words, *Qua mihi & factorem*, &c. which explain the Fathers ſence, our Dr. wholly omits, and beguiles his Reader with theſe perverted particles, *if it be not written*: *Tertullian*, after thoſe words [*In Evangelio vero amplius*] goes on, *An autem de aliqua ſubiacenti materia facta ſint omnia nuſquam adhuc legi*: Whether all theſe things be made of a ſubjacent matter, I never yet read: *Scriptum eſſe doceat Hermogenis officina*; Let *Hermogenes* his Work-houſe ſhew us that this particular is written. *Si non eſt Scriptum, timeat væ illud adjicientibus, aut detrahentibus deſtinatum*; If this thing now in controverſie concerning the prejacent matter *Hermogenes* aſſerts, be not written; let him juſtly fear that Wo deſtin'd to them that detract from Scripture, or add to it. Here is exactly the whole context of *Tertullian*; and it renders this ſence; *Hermogenes* holds the world made of a ſtrange unknown matter: The Scripture directly tells us how it was made and *Created* of nothing. I adore the fulneſs of Scripture in this particular; let therefore *Hermogenes* (when the Scripture hath clearly ſaid all that belongs to the firſt Creation of things) prove by Scripture that unknown matter he defends; if he cannot, he may well fear that Wo threatned to ſuch as detract from Scripture, or add to it a prejacent matter never mentioned in it. Judge good Reader whether this Quotation have ſo much as a likelyhood of gain-ſaying any conſtant received Tradition in the Church. The Dr. may reply, as *Hermogenes* added to Scripture his unknown matter, ſo we add our unknown Traditions: I anſwer firſt, what *Hermogenes* defended was not only an addition, but expreſly contrary

to

to Holy Scripture, declaring that God made the VVorld of Nothing: No Catholick Tradition is expreſly or poſitively oppoſite to Gods written VVord (unknown tradition we own not) 2. *Hermogenes* had no ſuch approved conſent for his foolery, as we have for our Catholick, and ever received Tradition; juſtly therefore did *Tertullian* oppugn him by the Authority of Scripture only; for deſtitute he was of all warranted Tradition: 3. The Doctrine of our Tradition (not a pretended one, or any ſuperaddition of new Articles, as the Dr. imputes to us) is expreſly allow'd of by Scripture it ſelf; the place is known 2 *Theſſa.* 2. 14. and enervates what ever hath the colour of an objection againſt us.

He cites next St. *Baſil de vera fide*, whoſe words are theſe *Paris* Print 1618. *Tom.*2. page 251. *Haud dubie manifeſtiſſimum hoc infidelitatis argumentum fuerit, & ſignum ſuperbiæ certiſſimum, ſi quis eorum quæ Scripta ſunt aliquid velit rejicere, aut eorum quæ non Scripta introducere*: VVithout doubt this is a moſt manifeſt Argument of infidelity, if one will reject any one of thoſe things which are written (theſe words our Dr. omits, to make the Quotation ſound to his ſence) or, of thoſe things which are not written, introduce; to wit, into Scripture; and ſo the St. explicates himſelf clearly in theſe following words—— *Vehementiſſime interdicat ne quid eorum quæ in Divinis literis habeantur, dematur, aut quod abſit, addatur*: VVhich is in plain Engliſh to ſay, Add we muſt not, nor diminiſh any thing in Scripture. No Catholick pretends to make that Scripture, which is not Scripture: Nor to diminiſh ſo much as one jot in that ſacred Book: You ſee therefore, ſo *forceleſs* this Authority is to gain-ſay received Tradition, that it doth not ſo much as touch upon the very Queſtion: As prooffleſs

alſo are thoſe other two Quotations in the Doctors Margent out of St. *Baſil*'s Morals; for *regula* 72. *C.*1. in the ſame Edition, page 372. He only ſpeak's as the Apoſtle doth; *Though an Angel Preach another Goſpel then what is Preached, let him be Anathematized*, and *reg.*80.*cap.* 22. pag. 386. he ſaith no more, but that we muſt believe the true force of thoſe things that are in Scripture; reject nothing, or make any thing new, *extra divinam Scripturam*; that is, as I interpret, without the warranty of Scripture: but the Scripture indubitably warrants the declarations of Councils (witneſs the *Nicen* definitions) and conſtant received Tradition of the Church. Therefore this Authority alſo is wholly impertinent to the Doctors purpoſe.

VVho next, to oppoſe Tradition, cites *Theoph. Alexandrinus* in Engliſh, thus; *It is the part of a deuilliſh ſpirit to think any thing to be divine, that is not in the Authority of Holy Scripture.* I Anſwer, here are three faults in this one Quotation: Firſt, The words are not faithfully cited; Secondly, They are weighed out of their circumſtances, and wreſted contrary to the Authors meaning; Thirdly, VVere they as the Doctor would have them, they prove nothing againſt Tradition. Briefly, all know how ſharp an Adverſary *Theop. Alex.* was to *Origen* and his followers; He writ expreſly againſt his errors, but that work is not extant; and in his 2. Epiſt. *paſchali* cited by the Doctor (you have it *Tom.* 4. *Biblioth. Patrum, Cullen* Print 1618. pag. 716.) after he had checked *Origen* for his raſhneſs, for broaching Fopperies of his own head, and arrogantly making himſelf his own Maſter, contrary to St. *Pauls* Humility who conferred the Goſpel with other Apoſtles: He ſpeaks thus of *Origen* ſolely; *Sed ignorans quod Dæmoniaci ſpiritus eſſet inſtinctus ſophiſmata humanarum*

narum mentium ſequi, & aliquid extra Scripturarum authoritatem putare Divinum : But not knowing that it is an inſtinct of a Devilliſh ſpirit to follow the ſophiſtry or deceit of mans VVit (theſe words which fully expreſs the Authors ſence our Doctor totally omit's) or to think any thing divine, not authorized, or without the Authority of Holy Scripture: So *Theophilus*; who, as you ſee, wholly here relates to *Origen*'s private errors, condemns his Pride, oppoſeth his ſophiſtry and boldneſs, in making himſelf a maſter of new Fancies, but toucheth not the leaſt on Catholick Doctrine, concerning unwritten Tradition: and though the Doctor draws him to ſuch a ſence; it is ſoon anſwer'd, that Catholick Tradition, ſo expreſly approved by Scripture, cannot be thought a Doctrine *extra Scripturæ authoritatem*, without warrant of Gods Word. Now if he tells us that he oppoſeth not any ancient Tradition, but our pretended *one* only that found's *New Articles*, *New Propoſitions*, &c. I Anſwer, He meerly combates with ſhadows; we neither own ſuch a Tradition, nor can the Doctor prove it: He ſhould have firſt named *one* or *two* of theſe New Articles, and then aſſaulted us with the Authority of Fathers directly oppoſite to our Doctrine, and not winck and fight, as he doth againſt no man knows what. If he ſays again, that he impugns all Tradition in general, all Doctrine not expreſly contain'd in Scripture; forced he is, not only to throw away Scripture it ſelf, and the *Nicen* definitions: not only to diſclaim a Trinity of Perſons in one Divine Eſſence, Baptizing Children, *&c.* but every tenet of Proteſtant Religion (as Proteſtaniſm) *E. G.* the belief of two Sacraments *only*, which is not at all contain'd in Scripture, nor can it be drawn from Scripture by any probable diſcourſe or gloſs of Proteſtant

teſtants, though theſe are worſe, and leſs able to derive unto us a true belief, then the pooreſt tradition (were any ſuch) that the Doctor can except againſt in the Catholick Church. When the Doctor pleaſeth, I am ready to diſcuſs this ſole point with him of proving Proteſtant Tenets by Scripture only: I believe he will not accept the Challenge.

Againſt the worſhipping of Images, he cites *Lactantius, lib. 2 cap. de Orig. Error*: obſerve, I beſeech you. *Lactantius* hath ſeven Books *de Divin. Inſtit. adverſus gentes*, the Title to his ſecond Book is *de Origine erroris*, which contains ninty Chapters; and our Doctor unskilfully throws the Title of the whole Book into a Chapter not found at all in the Author, either in my Copy, *ann.* 1465. or in that extent *Biblioth. Patrum ſæculo* 3. pag. 224. However Chap. 18. theſe words are found, *Quare non eſt dubium, quin religio nulla ſit, ubicunque ſimulacrum eſt*, which the Doctor unworthily tranſlates thus, *without all peradventure wherever an Image is (meaning for worſhip) there is no Religion*; I ſay *unworthily* (and it pitties me to ſee ſo much want of candor) for here a ſence is rendered, as if *Lactantius* declaim'd againſt the uſe and worſhip of Images among Chriſtians; whereas it is more then evident, that he only ſpeaks againſt *Simulacra*, (not Images) againſt the Idols, and Gods of the Gentils: *Non ſub pedibus quærat Deum*, ſaith he, in the beginning of this eighteenth Chapter; None is to ſeek for his God under his feet: *Nec a veſtigijs ſuis eruat quod adoret*, Nor pull from under his footſteps what he is to adore: *Sed quærat in ſublimi, quærat in ſummo*, Let him look for God above in Heaven, *&c.* The Worſhip therefore of one Supream God, *Lactantius* chiefly preſſeth in this whole ſecond book: In his firſt Chapter he tells us, that

he

he had above demonſtrated the falſe Religion of many Gods; and that in this ſecond Book, he declares againſt the Gentils, the cauſe or *Origen* of their multiplying many gods. In his ſecond Chapter he ſaith, That though the Image of a man abſent be neceſſary, yet to circumſcribe God, diffuſed every where, in any form, is both needleſs and ſuperfluous; afterward he ſhews that no deceaſed men, nor any thing in this world ought to be adored as God. In his fourth Chapter he gives this reaſon, *Unde apparet iſtos deos nihil in ſe habere amplius quam materiam de quâ ſunt fabricati*: Theſe gods have nothing but only the matter they are made of. In his eighth Chapter he propoſeth the queſtion how theſe falſe Gods of the Gentils did work ſtrange wonders, and proſecutes the ſame ſubject in his ninth Chapter. In a word, *Lactantius* through this whole Treatiſe, ſpeaks no more againſt the Catholick uſe of Images, then I do now while I defend them; yet hear we muſt the Doctor talk, and without all *peradventure*, as if he had read *where an Image is, there is no Religion*; without all peradventure the good man is deceived. I ſay no more: To what he next cites out of *Origen*, we ſhall anſwer hereafter. Now to the Doctors Chapters and Sections.

CHAP

CHAP. I.

Of the Doctors ungrounded discourse, to the wrongful charge on Catholicks, for making new Articles in Faith.

THough my task be chiefly to follow the Doctor in his Quotations, and note, (as he goes along) some few of his many Errors: Yet touch I must a little on a discourse he is pleased to begin with, Chapter the first: It seems to enervate much our Christian Faith, and weaken the Authority of the most Ancient Councils.

Page then the fourth and first Section, he holds the two Testaments, the words of Christ and of the Apostles, the Fountains of Faith; (which none denies) but next he adds; *whatsoever came in after these*, foris est, *is to be cast out, it belongs not unto Christ.* This latter assertion (to say no more) hath too much of the *harshness* in it: for the difinitions of the *Nicen* Council, and of the other three general Councils, with St. *Athanasius* his Creed, came in after the words of Christ, and Holy Scripture; are these, Think ye, like old Garments to be laid aside, or *cast out*, as not at all belonging to Christ? belong they do most certainly, as Rivers to their Fountains, though not own'd as Original Springs, and the first Foundations of our Faith. Observe therefore, I beseech you, how the Doctor deals with us, how he leads us on in darkness, whilst he sets men a seeking after

ter the Fountains of Faith, but with it, turns by the Stream, cuts of the Torrent of Authority whereby to find them; that is in a word, he makes null all Authority that can assert with certainty, *Such were the words of Christ, such the Doctrine of the Apostles*, &c.

Judge whether I say not aright, and demand of the Doctor upon whose certain proposal can he rely, or indubitably admit of Christ's words as sacred? If he answers Scripture; the Question return's again, and he is asked a new, who it is that doth ascertain him of Scripture? If the Fathers, they are, with him, Fallible, yes, and full of ambiguous sences. If the Church, that (saith he) is changeable, hath brought in novelties contrary to Ancient Faith; if Councils, not one is found but lyable to Error. Turn by therefore these intermedial Streams running between us and the Fountains of Faith, destroy the certainty of such Witnesses, say that no man, or society of men since Christ and his Apostles hath, (without a possibility of erring) assured us that Christ spake, that the Evangelists writ as they did; the whole Scripture, God knows, will be cast aside also; yes, and become a comfortless, an unwarranted Book. Whence follow's a total ruin of Christian Religion. This is not my assertion, but the great St. *Austins* (the Quotation is known) *Tom. 6. contra epistolam Manichei, cap. 5. Ego vero Evangelio non crederem*, &c. I would not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Church moved me to believe it.

Our Doctor may think he salves this objection in his next ensuing lines, pag. 4. where he saith; *To these* (that is to Scripture) *we add, not as Authors, but as helpers of our Faith, and Heirs of the Doctrine Apostolical the senti-*

ments, and Catholick Doctrine of the Church in the Ages next after the Apoſtles; not that we think, &c. I Anſwer: Here is, no man *knows what*, confuſedly ſhut up in two Ambiguous VVords; *Heirs* and *Helpers*: to get out of darkneſs, I might firſt demand; how knows the Doctor now exactly, what the Sentiments, or Catholick Doctrine of the Church Anciently were in the Ages next after the Apoſtles? The Propoſal of our preſent Church (overgrown, as he ſaith, with a thouſand Errors) is an inſufficient warranty: Both Fathers, and Councils were even then Fallible; and had they been Infallible, their writings ſince that, may perhaps have fallen into ill hands, and loſt their purity. But I wave this diſcourſe; and propoſe to our preſent purpoſe this Queſtion only. Are we Chriſtians now being, obliged under Damnation to believe thoſe Sentiments of the Ancient Church, as undoubted *Helpers*, as certain apparent *Heirs* of Divine Truth, or no? if not: They caſt us wholly upon uncertainties, and may as well help us on to Err, as hit right: if we are bound to own them as certain *Heirs* of Divine Truth; Scripture muſt aſſure it, (for ſaith the Doctor, *To believe any thing Divine, that is not Scripture, is a diviliſh ſpirit*) and undoubtedly affirm that at leaſt in the Ages next after Chriſt, there was a ſociety of men, not lyable to Error, that kept our Chriſtian Faith entire without ſpot or blemiſh, faithfully tranſmitted it to Poſterity, *&c.* Now all I can deſire of the Doctor is, to produce that Scripture, which purifies the Ancient Church only, and makes the next enſuing Ages of that Church Spurious in Doctrine, fearfully deſpicable, and lyable to Error. Thus much I am confident he ſhall never ſhew: for our deareſt Saviour that Eſtabliſhed a Chriſtian Church, promiſed he would be with it to the end of the World.

World. Gods alſeeing providence drives not on his work by halfs, nor leaves his Church when the Doctors fancy liſteth: Souls are now as dear to Chriſt as they were in the Primitive Ages: He ſhed his Sacred Blood for All; if then he ſecured his Church from Error, and directed Souls into Truth; he doth the like favour now, and will not permit his Immaculate Spouſe to beguile them with falſhood.

All therefore the Doctor ſaith here, is a deceitful Paralogiſm, yes, and Paradoxes, not to be tolerated. A Paradox it is, to talk of *Heirs*, and *Helpers* of Apoſtolical Doctrine, and rob them of their Infallibility. A Paradox it is to ſay, that theſe *Heirs*, and *Helpers ſent Milions of Souls into the Boſom of Chriſt*, and caſt more Milions in after Ages out of his Boſom, for want of true Faith. A Paradox it is, that Chriſt only remained with his Church for a time, and then left it deſtitute of Divine Aſſiſtance; yes, and in points moſt Fundamental. But the greateſt Paradox of all which amuſes every one, is; That now towards an end of the World, a new ſort of unknown men (the Doctor is one) will become our Teachers, and tell us exactly how long Chriſt was with his Church, and when he leap'd out of it. He was with it, ſay they, for ſome three or four hundred years, and then left it, fluctuating, toſſed, and at laſt ſaw it without Mercy overturned with a deluge of Errors. And credit this we muſt upon their bare word, becauſe they ſay it; without Scripture, without Reaſon, yes, expreſly contrary to both, and all Ancient Authority.

The Doctor to prove the Church by Scripture only, quotes St. *Auſtin* in his Margent, pag. 4. *de unit. eccleſiæ cap.* 3, & 4. 5. but both mangles his words, and conceals the force of his Argument. *Sunt certe* (ſaith the

Saint) *libri Dominici quorum Authoritati utrique conſentimus, utrique credimus*, &c. There are certain books of our Lord (He means Scripture) to whoſe Authority we both yeild, we both believe: *Ibi Quæramus eccleſiam*, Let us look for the Church there *&c.* That is, ſeeing we both, who now diſpute, admit of Scripture, and believe it, let us upon ſuch *a ſuppoſition* go forward and prove the Church by Scripture: which is an excellent way of Arguing; but if any queſtion the Authority of Scripture it ſelf, take it we muſt (when we make a right Analyſis) upon the Church's Authority ſolely; and ſay with St. *Auſtin*: I would not believe the Scripture but for the Church.

I omit the brags he hath pag. 6. of Proteſtants being more then *indubitably Conquerors* (meer empty words) and obſerve how he puts himſelf on a new trouble, pag. 7th. where he ſaith; *whatſoever we cannot prove by Scripture we diſclaim it.* I will not here tell the Doctor he muſt then diſclaim every Tenet of Proteſtant Religion, (no more in Scripture then Arianiſm) as it ſtands oppoſite to the *Roman* Faith: But briefly, I argue thus; A Church ſecured from Error, and which Infallibly propoſeth Divine Truth can be proved by Scripture, or cannot: If the firſt, there was, is, and ſhall ever be in the World a ſociety of Chriſtians un-errable, and certain in Doctrine that neither injures Faith, nor (by intromitting Novelties) deſtroy Apoſtolical Doctrine; for the Scripture, (as we now ſuppoſe) ſaith ſo, and what it ſaith is true. One favour therefore I humbly beg of the Doctor that he would by *a plain deſignation* point me out this unerrable body of Chriſtians; and clearly alſo deſign me ſuch known *out caſt Chriſtians*, that are not of this Moral body; my demand is reaſonable, and require's no long diſcourſe, nor any definition of a Church

Church, but to have this unerring company deſign'd, and candidly.

If the Scripture Warrant's not ſuch an Infallible company of Chriſtians; the Doctor (though he pretend to it) can never believe with a true, and infallible Act of Supernatural faith, that the Ancient Church Inherited Catholick Doctrine; that it ſent Milions of Souls to Heaven: That what we now read, is the Apoſtles Creed; that the Ancient Councils erred not in their Definitions; No, nor that there ever was, or is now, Pure, and Incorrupt Scripture among Chriſtians: I ſay, he cannot believe theſe truths with a certain aſſent of Supernatural Faith, but at moſt with a meer opinative Judgment, which may as well be wrong, as right; falſe, as true: ſtaggering aſſuredly it is, and not ſteddy (if a meer Opinion) yes, and wholly deſtitute of that ſtrength, which God requires to Supernatural Faith.

In his 10*th.* page he is fierce againſt the Church of *Rome*, for pretending to a power not only of declaring New Articles of Faith, but of making new Symbols, and Creeds, and impoſing them as neceſſary to Salvation. To this purpoſe he cites the Bull of *Leo* the tenth againſt *Martin Luther*; whoſe twenty ſeventh Propoſition is this, and condemned; *Certum eſt, in manu Eccleſiæ, aut Papæ, non eſſe ſtatuere Articulos fidei, imo nec leges morum ſeu bonorum operum.* It is certain that it is not in the hand of the Church, or Pope, to appoint, or determine Articles of Faith; nor Laws of manners, or good Works.

Firſt, here is not a word of making new Articles or Creeds; and the word *ſtatuere* may as well ſignifie to determine a Queſtion not yet decided, as to make any thing a new; but to paſs theſe niceties, and ſhew clear-

ly

ly the Doctors Error: I demand whether the Fathers aſſembled together in the *Nicen* Council made new Articles of Faith againſt the *Arians*? whether St. *Athanatius* in his Creed did the like? who was no Pope. What the Doctors Anſwer is here, is ours alſo for all and every Definition made by the Church in after Ages.

And I would have him to reflect, that as he now cavil's at both Pope, and Church, for conſtituting new Articles; ſo the *Arians* might have done againſt the *Nicen* Council, and *Athanaſius* his Creed; yes, and cried out, *Novelties, novelties*, as loud as the Doctor. In a word then, I anſwer, with St. *Gregory* in *Ezechiel homit.* XVI *poſt. med.* pag. 1164. *6. edit. Antwerp.* 1615. that, *per incrementa temporum Crevit ſcientia ſpiritalium Patrum*: With time Faith encreaſed, but how? not that either the Church or Pope have Power to coin Articles at pleaſure, or to force Chriſtians to the acceptance of Novelties contrary to Scripture, or ancient Tradition; No, but the Power given them is to diſpence the Myſteries of the Word of God, to lay out more clearly verities contained in Scriptnre, (ſo the Fathers did in the *Nicen* Council, when they defined the Son to be conſubſtantial with his Father, which word ὁμούσιος is never read in Scripture) Finally, to declare more explicitely what the Ancient Tradition of the Church, and ſence of the Fathers hath been; within ſuch a compaſs the Church holds it ſelf, when after mature deliberation it defines in Council.

Hence both Divines, and Canoniſts teach; that rigorouſly ſpeaking, the Church hath no new Articles of Faith; but only a more full, and explicite knowledge of that belief, which anciently was among Primitive Chriſtians; yet none there is, that reads our Doctor, both

both in the page now cited, and elſewhere after; but muſt have this perſwaſion wrought in him, that the Church and Pope, may define as it were at Random; make new Articles, new Creeds as they liſt; and impoſe them as neceſſary to Salvation. All is falſe, and fraudulent dealing.

CHAP. II.

The Doctors Quotations not true. His Errors concerning the Index Expurgatorius. *His ill dealing with* Sixtus Senenſis.

THe Doctor in his tenth page, to prove our making new Articles, cites *Auguſtinus Triumphus de Anconſa quæſt.* 59 Art. 1 & 2. and pittifully abuſeth that Catholick Author, who in his reſolution Art. 10. concludes thus; *Reſpondeo quod hanc quæſtionem determinat Auguſtinus libro* 1. *de ſymbolo, ubi vult, quod omnis ſymboli condendi, & ordinandi in ſancta dei eccleſia terminatur authoritas.* I Anſwer, St *Auſtin* reſolves this Queſtion, *lib.* 1. *de ſymbolo*, Where he ſaith, That all Authority of making and ſetting a Symbol in order is within the bounds of the Church. (Mark firſt St. *Auſtins* words; *Omnis authoritas condendi & ordinandi*, &c.) Then follow theſe other in *Anconitanus* his reſolution, (wrongfully interpreted, and unhandſomly mangled by the Doctor) *Ex his patere poteſt, quod novum ſymbolum condere, ſolum ad Papam ſpectat*;

ſpectat; nam in Symbolo ponuntur illa, quæ univerſaliter pertinent ad Chriſtianam fidem: By this you may ſee that to make a new Symbol belongs only to the Pope; for thoſe things are ſet down in a Symbol, which Univerſally concern Chriſtian Faith. Theſe laſt words which explicate both St. *Auſtins*, and *Anconitanus* his meaning are fraudulently left out by the Doctor: Briefly then, *condere Symbolum* are St. *Auſtins* words; and both in his ſence, and this Authors, ſtand conſignificant with *Ordinare*; which is not to make a Novelty in Faith, but to reduce to a Method, or ſhort form thoſe Points which Chriſtians both now do believe, and have anciently believed in the general; moſt evidently this is *Anconitanus* his ſence: Firſt, by the words now cited (*Nam in Symbolo ponuntur illa, quæ Univerſaliter*, &c.) 2. By the expreſs Doctrine in his reſolution, where he ſaith; *Una fuit fides antiquorum, & modernorum*, one Faith there was anciently; And now; 3. by his anſwer to the 2*d*. Argument Art. 2*d*. *Ad ſecundum eſt dicendum; quod ad illa quæ in ſacra Scriptura ponuntur, non debet fieri aliqua additio erroris, vel falſitatis, vel diminutio veritatis; ſed addere veritatem, quam continet* (*Scriptura*) *explicare & ſemper licuit Eccleſiæ, & ſemper licet.* To the ſecond Argument we ſay, That to thoſe things which are in Holy Scripture, no addition of error, or falſhood is to be made, nor diminution of Truth. But to add a verity, which the Scripture contains, was, and is ever lawful in the Church.

As he deals with *Anconitanus*, ſo he abuſeth *Panormitanus cap. cum Chriſtus*; the Doctor cites him thus; *Papa poteſt inducere novum Articulum fidei*, and leav's of there: But *Panormitan*'s words are, *Papa poteſt inducere novum Articulum fidei, declarando iſtud jus Divinum & ex hoc infertur quod iſta Conſtitutio reſpicit præterita.* The Pope

The Pope can introduce a new Article of Faith by declaring it to be Divine; whence we have, that this conſtitution relates to things paſt. Mark; a declarative Sentence, and of things anciently believed.

Laſtly, he cites *Oſtienſis*, and *Ferdinandus de Inciſo apud Petrum Ciezam*, an Author I never heard of; but aſſuredly moſt falſe it is, that any Catholick Writer ſaies; The Souls of men are in the hands of the Pope, and that in his Arbritration Religion doth conſiſt.

Page 12. he tells us of a ſtory of the King of *Spain* giving Commiſſion to purge all Catholick Authors, with ſuch ſecrecy that the Expurgatory *Index* might not be imparted to any. *Honſoever*, ſaith he, *by Divine providence* Joannes Pappus, *and* Franciſcus Junius 13 *years after met with it, made it publick; and ſince it came abroad againſt the Inquiſitors wills; they own it, and have printed it themſelves*: Yet more: in their *Index*, ſome words in St. *Chriſoſtom*, others in St. *Auſtin* are commanded to be blotted out; yes, and *Sixtus Senenſis* in his Epiſtle Dedicatory highly commends the Pope, *Pius Quintus*, for purging all Catholick Authors, and chiefly the writings of the Ancient Fathers. Thus the Doctor: and he layes a foul aſpertion on us for corrupting of Witneſſes, and razing out the Records of Antiquity.

I anſwer that he is both falſe, and faulty through this whole Paragraph; faulty, in telling us of a clancular commiſſion given by the King of *Spain* to the Inquiſitors, *&c.* without directing us to either Book, or *Index* where to find it: Faulty he is, in aſſerting (without nameing his Author) that the Inquiſitors were forced to own the Expurgatory *Index*, becauſe *Pappus*, and *Junius*

mius had firſt printed it againſt their wills; faulty, finally he is, for citing words razed out of St. *Chriſoſtom* by an *Index expurgatorius*, and leaving his Reader in darkneſs where to find the Quotations.

Now to his falſities which are evident: In St. *Chriſoſtoms* works (ſaith he) Printed at *Baſil* theſe words [*The Church is not Built upon the Man, but upon the Faith*] are commanded to be blotted out: yet they are read in his firſt Homily, upon that of St. *Iohn*, *Ye are my Friends*. Here are two falſities: The firſt is, that theſe words are commanded to be blotted out of St. *Chriſoſtom's works*; whereas, moſt certainly the Prohibition falls only on St *Chriſoſtom's* Index made by *Froben*, Printer at *Baſil*, or ſome of his Friends: And is it not groſs to miſtake the Index of a Book (drawn out by God knows whom) for the Authors Doctrine? If the Reader pleaſe to ſee, that I wrong not the Doctor, let him turn to this Index publiſhed by Cardinal *Sandonal's* order, and Printed at *Madrid*, *anno* 1612. pag 556. he ſhall read *Ex D. Iohannis Chriſoſtomi Indice Baſileæ ex officina Frobeniana, dele ſequentia*: and, in the very next page (1. *columna*) ſoon after the middle theſe words of *Frobens Index*. *Eccleſia non ſuper hominem, ſed ſupra fidem ædificata.*

The ſecond Error is, that theſe words are found in the Homily now cited upon St. *Iohn*; believe it, there is not a ſyllable like them in that Homily. Again, ſaith the Doctor, theſe words of St. *Chriſoſtom* [*There is no merit, but what is given us by Chriſt*] are commanded to be blotted out; yet, they are found in his Sermon upon *Pentecoſt*. Here are three Errors at once: Firſt, the Index is taken for the Text: Secondly, *Frobens* words are not as the Doctor gives them, but thus: *Salus noſtra non ex merito noſtro*: Our Salvation is not by our

our merit, ſee the Index, pag. 558. 1. *columna.* 3. Theſe words. *There is no merit*, &c. are not in the Homily of *Pentecoſt*, but in the other upon St. *John*; *Ye are my Friends*: and as they ſtand in St. *Chriſoſtom*'s Text, are thus (*Frobens* Edition) *Nullum in nobis meritum niſi quod contulit Chriſtus.* There is no Merit but what Chriſt gave us, which is moſt Catholick Doctrine. Again, thoſe words: *The Church is not built upon the man*, &c. Are not in that Homily on St. *John*, *Ye are my Friends*: but in St. *Chriſoſtom*'s Homily on *Pentecoſt*. In a word, to ſpeak plain Engliſh, our Doctor cited *Kim Kam*, one Homily for an other, which may paſs for a fault or falſity, make of it what you pleaſe. However, he may yet reply, though he miſcited the places, at leaſt grant we muſt, that thoſe words, *The Church is not built upon the man*, &c. are extant in the *Pentecoſt Homily*; and the Index Expurgatory commands them to be razed out. I anſwer, that it commands them to be razed out of *Frobens* Index, is granted; out of St. *Chriſoſtom*'s works, is denyed; which yet our Doctor affirms: And herein *John Pappus* is the more honeſt man of the two, for he ingeniouſly confeſſeth in the 3*d*. page of his Preface, (*anno* 1599) that we never yet had the boldneſs to change or cancelate a word in the writings of *Eccleſiaſtical* Authors, read his 11*th*. line: *Eo audaciæ nondum proruperunt*, &c. The Doctor may yet demand why then purge we *Frobens* Index, of words found in St. *Chriſoſtom*'s Works? I anſwer, becauſe, as they ſtand nudely in that Index deveſted of their precedent and ſubſequent words, they may render a harſher ſence to a Captious Reader, and not ſound well to any ear, though pondered with a further explication of the Author, they ſoon loſe the harſhneſs and clear themſelves. And ſo really is this very ſentence, if you'll compare

it with thoſe following words of St. *Chriſoſtom* in *Frobens* Edition: *Hoc eſt, ſuper confeſſionem, ſuper ſermones pietatis*, &c. That is, Chriſt built his Church not upon the *man*, as *man*, but upon *Peter*, confeſſing and piouſly acknowledging his Saviours Divinity, which *Fleſh and Blood taught him not*, &c. You ſee therefore a ſentence weighed out of its circumſtances changes often moſt blamleſs Doctrine, and ſpeaks well with them, leſs well without them. One only inſtance in Doctor *Taylors* 167. page ſhall ſerve for our purpoſe, where he cites *Bellarmine* thus: *If the Pope ſhould Err by commanding ſin and forbiding Virtue, the whole Church were bound to believe that Vices were good, and Virtue evil; unleſs ſhe would ſin againſt her Conſcience.* Theſe words are *Bellarmin's*, and as they ſtand in the Doctor, ſound harſhly, (and therefore he Quotes them) but read in *Bellarmine* they have an excellent ſence, and directly prove that neither Church nor Pope can Err: whereof ſee morein the 28. Chapter of this Treatiſe: So true it is, that words as they run on in the Context of an Author, are often harmleſs, though ſtript of their *adjuncta*, they may prove hurtful to a leſs diligent Reader. Our Doctor in his Diſſwaſive is almoſt endleſs, with theſe maimed and half-quoted Authorities.

Obſerve laſtly, good Reader, how unworthily the Doctor (pag. 13.) deals with *Sixtus Senenſis* by turning the Genuine ſence of his words into another, highly injurious: Mark I beſeech you. *Sixtus* Praiſeth Pope *Pius* the 5*th*. for purging the Ancient Fathers, vitiated by modern Hereticks, *&c*. But our Doctor (for ſooth) will not allow him this ſence, but makes him ſpeak as if he extolled the Pope for razing out the Fathers own Doctrine. To know the truth, read *Sixtus* his Epiſtle Dedicatory, (it is before his *Bibliotheca*) where he

ſpeaks

ſpeaks thus to *Pius Quintus* : *Deinde expurgari, & emaculari curaſti omnia Catholicorum Scriptorum, ac præcipuè Veterum Patrum Scripta hæreticorum ætatis noſtræ facibus contaminata, & venenis infecta.* You have cauſed (ſaith he) all the writings of Catholick Authors, and chiefly the Ancient Fathers *ſtained* with the dreggs of Hereticks in *this our Age*, and poyſoned with their Venome, to be purged, and made clear from blemiſh. What is here more offenſive then to take Poyſon out of a ſound body? Yet our Doctor to perſwade the world, that Popes are ever buſie in cancelating the Records of Antiquity, gives you only *Sixtus* his firſt words: *You have purged the Ancient Fathers*, &c. and there fraudulently leaves of, utterly concealing what follows, and clears all : *Hereticorum, facibus contaminata*, &c. that is, You have purged the Ancient Fathers, contaminated with Hereſie in theſe our days.

Briefly then our Doctor by this Quotation would either have his Reader judge that *Sixtus* praiſed the Pope for blotting out the Authentick writings of the Fathers, or only for purging them from later Hereſie: If the ſecond, its worthy praiſe; if the firſt, *viz.* that the Pope is here commended for blotting out the writings of the Ancient Fathers (which is the only thing aim'd at) I do affirm this a flat corruption, a wrong (as you ſee) to *Sixtus*. A ginne to catch the unwary Reader; and therefore deplorable in a Doctor of Divinity. What is further oppoſed in that 13. page of places razed out of St. *Auſtin* is an Error; read the above mentioned Expurgatory Index, pag. 37. and you ſhall find the correction to be made upon *Eraſmus* and *Ludovicus* his Notes, not on St. *Auſtins* words; and page the 39, you have *Cluadius Chevalonius* his Index upon St. *Auſtin* amended, not any ſyllable of the Saint's

cor-

corrected. And this is the first, which our Doctor storms at: *Solus Deus est adorandus:* God only is to be adored. *Frobens* Indices mentioned in the same page of our Doctor, deserved correction, wholly contrary to the Originals.

CHAP. III.

The Doctors Quotations not right: Prayer for the dead proves a Purgatory.

TO what the Doctor hath in his 2*d.* Section, page the 14*th.* concerning the power of making new Articles, we have answered already, and say that the Church coyns no Novelty; yet may explicitly declare what anciently was believed *implicitly.* The Declaration is new, the substance of the Article as old as Christianity: In the next page after, he had a fling at a new Article ready for stamp concerning the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, (which is more then he knows) He passeth to his third Section of Indulgences, page 16. where he cites St. *Antoninus Arch-Bishop of* Florence *parte* 1. *summæ cap.* 3. saying, *we have nothing expresly for Indulgences in Scripture &c.* The Doctor omits what follows immediately; *quamvis ad hoc inducatur illud Apostoli* 2. *cor.* 2. *si quid donavi vobis propter vos in persona Christi.* Although saith *Antoninus*, that of the Apostle is alledged, *si quid*, &c. He cites again our Bishop *Fisher* in Art. 18.

18. *Lutheri* to this ſence; *At the beginning of the Church there was no uſe of Indulgences.* Anſwer, he ſaith it not ſo abſolutely, but with this interrogation; *Quis jam de Indulgentjis mirari poteſt?* and expreſly in the beginning of that Article hath theſe words: *Fuit tamen non nullus earum uſus, ut aiunt, apud Romanos vetuſtiſſimus, quod vel ex ſtationibus in urbe frequentiſſimis intelligi datur.* There was, as they ſay, a moſt ancient Uſe and Practiſe of theſe Indulgences at *Rome*, which thing the moſt frequented Stations of that City gives us to underſtand.

In the reſt of that Section, he hath only Vulgar Objections anſwered over and over, and a number of calumnies a riſing from the miſunderſtanding of Catholick Doctrine: I therefore leave him, for it is not my task to repeat what hath been moſt largely writ concerning Indulgences by others.

What I find more material in the Doctors fourth Section is, page 27. *where he tells us our Writers vainly ſuppoſe, that when the H. Fathers ſpeak of Prayer for the dead, they conclude for Purgatory; For it is true, ſaith he, the Fathers did Pray for the dead; But how? that God would ſhew them Mercy, and haſten their Reſurrection*, &c. Mark well, that *God would ſhew them Mercy*: whence *I argue*, if the Souls prayed for, be in Heaven, they have Mercy, the ſentence is given for their Eternal happineſs; if in Hell, they are wholly deſtitute of Mercy; vain therefore were the Prayers of the Fathers for Mercy, unleſs there be a third place where mercy can be ſhewed them. I would willingly know of the Doctor (if he would deal candidly) what St. *Auſtins* ingenious meaning was when he prayed thus for his Mother *Monica lib. 9. confeſſ. cap. 13. Dimitte illi & tu, debita ſua, ſi qua etiam contraxerit poſt tot annos poſt aquam ſalutis*: Forgive my Mother

ther her debts, if ſhe hath, after ſo many years contracted any, ſince Baptiſm: What are theſe debts? Again, *Non ſe interponat, nec vi, nec inſidiis Leo, vel Draco; neque enim reſpondebit illa, nihil ſe debere, ne convincatur*, &c. *Sed reſpondebit dimiſſa debita ſua ab eo*, &c. Let not that Infernal Enemy, intermeddle by his force, or treachery; ſhe will not anſwer that ſhe owes nothing, leaſt ſhe be convicted, but will ſay her debts are remitted by him, *&c.* Afterwards he beggs of his Brethren to Pray for his deceaſed Mother, at the Altar; and above in the ſame Chapter ſpeaking to Almighty God, he gives this reaſon why he Prayes: *Quia vero non requiris delicta vehementer, fiducialiter ſperamus aliquem apud te locum inveniri Indulgentiæ*: Becauſe you deal not ſeverely with offences; confident we are that a place for Mercy may be found, for Pardon and Remiſſion; that is in plain language for Remiſſion of Pains: But in Heaven all is remitted, in Hell there is nothing forgiven. Let the Doctor make here the inference, and conclude for Purgatory: There is no avoyding it.

Yet he goes on: *It is to be remembred that they (the Fathers) made prayers, and offered for thoſe, who by the confeſſion of all ſides, never were in Purgatory; for the Patriarks, Apoſtles*, &c. *and eſpecially for the Bleſſed Virgin* Mary: *So we find in* Epiphanius, *and Saint* Cyril.

The Doctor here is both out, and unlucky in his citations: firſt, there is not one word (in either place cited) of the Bleſſed Virgin. Secondly, Not a ſyllable of Pardon, or Remiſſion of Debts, when a memory is made of Patriarks, Apoſtles, *&c.* (which is only to the purpoſe) but expreſly the contrary. Be pleaſed to hear St. *Epiphanius* Hereſie 75. where he ſpeaks thus: *Pro juſtis, & peccatoribus memoriam facimus, pro peccatoribus quidem,*

dem, misericordiam Dei implorantes, pro justis vero, & Patribus, & Patriarchis, Prophetis, Apostolis, Evangelistis, &c. *ut dominum Iesum ab hominum ordine seperemus per honorem quem ipsi exhibemus, & adorationem ipsi præstemus*; that is, We remember both just men, and sinners; for sinners we implore Mercy; for the just, and for the Ancient Fathers, and Patriarks, Prophets, Apostles, *&c.* that we may seperate our Lord Jesus from the Order of men (living) by the honour we exhibit, and adoration we give him. Here is no praying for Patriarks, and Apostles, to have Pardon, or Remissio (as St. *Austin* did for his Mother) but a memory of them to honour Christ Jesus. St. *Cyril* also cited *Catech. Mystagog.* 5. is more plain against the Doctor: (*Cum hoc sacrificium offerimus* (saith he) *postea facimus memoriam etiam eorum omnium qui ante nobis obdormierunt, primùm Patriarcharum, Prophetarum, Apostolorum, Martyrum, ut Deus orationibus illorum, & deprecationibus suscipiat nostras preces.* When we offer up this Sacrifice, we afterward make a memory of all those who are departed this life; and first of the Patriarks, Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs, that God by their Prayers and interceſſions, would accept of our prayers: *Deinde pro defunctis Patribus, & Episcopis, denique pro omnibus oramus qui inter nos vita functi sunt, maximum esse credentes animarum juvamen pro quibus offertur obsecratio sancti illius & tremendi, quod in altari positum est, sacrificji.* Then we pray for the deceased Fathers, and Bishops who dyed amongst us, believing it a mighty help of Souls, for whom that holy, and dreadful Sacrifice, layd on the Altar, is offered up. And eight lines after: *Ad eundem modum & nos pro defunctis peccatoribus precationes adhibemus, non quidem coronam plectimus, sed Christum pro nostris peccatis mactatum offerimus, ut*

Observe praying to Saints.

Observe the Sacrifice of the Altar is offered for the deceased.

& nobis; & illis eum qui benignissimus est, propitium reddamus. In like manner we pray for departed sinners, not making them a Crown, but we offer up Christ slain for our sins, to make him who is most benign, propitious, and favourable both to our selves, and departed sinners: Unluckily, I say; did the Doctor make use of this place in his Dissuasive from Popery, which is all over old Popish Doctrine. First, a memory is made of Patriarks, Apostles, *&c.* not to have Pardon, or Remission; but that God *by their Prayers* accept of ours: Plain Popery. 2. We pray for all the deceased, believing those Souls are mightily benefitted, for whom that holy and dreadful Sacrifice of the Altar is offered: Two points of Popery more. 3. We offer Christ Jesus Sacrificed, *mactatum*, slain on the Altar; to the end that we may make Almighty God, who is most benign, merciful and propitious, both to our selves, and to the dead. Still nothing but Popery.

By what is here said, you may see the fraud of the Doctor, who unlearnedly argues thus: The Fathers prayed as well for Saints, as sinners, *Ergo*, from prayer for the dead no conclusion for Purgatory. Answer: These Fathers made a memory of *B.* Saints, as the Church still doth, but never prayed that they might be released from punishment, or have their debts forgiven, as St. *Austin* did for his Mother. Here then is the true Argument, and a most efficatious one: The Fathers prayed for deceased Souls, that they might have Mercy, Pardon, and Remission of Debts contracted in this life: They prayed that God would be propitious, and favourable to them; and for this end offered up Christ Jesus *Sacrificed* on the Altar: therefore the Fathers supposed a place, where Mercy, Pardon, and Remission might be had, where God can shew him-

himſelf propitious to them, and the unbloody Sacrifice may be offered on the Altar, for the cancelling their debts, and abating their torments. But this place is neither Heaven nor Hell, in the one, all debts are pardoned; in the other is no Remiſſion: *Ergo*, a third place or Purgatory is hence rightly concluded.

CHAP. IV.

The Doctors Quotations ſtill amiſs. St. Auſtin, *and* Otho Friſingenſis *are abuſed by him.*

THe Doctor, page 30. cites St. *Auſtin*, and *Otho Friſingenſis* againſt the Doctrine of Purgatory, but plainly corrupts both. St. *Auſtin* is quoted in his *Enchiridion*, *cap.* 69. and *lib.* 21. *de civitate cap.* 26. as one that doubts of Purgatory: By the way our Adverſary, and the Church of *England* go higher, and expreſly condemn the Doctrine of Purgatory. So the Doctor, page 28. which is more then St. *Auſtin* dared to venture on: But let that paſs: He gives you St. *Auſtins* words in Engliſh thus: *whether Purgatory be to be found or not, may be inquired, and poſſibly it may be found, and poſſibly it may never.* Anſw. There are no ſuch words; *and poſſibly it may never*: in either place of St. *Auſtin*; but here is the leaſt of Errors, for the whole drift of the Saints diſcourſe is miſtaken, who firſt lays this Principle in his precedent Chapter 68. that

ſome are Purged by the Fire of Tribulation, or Grief for the loſs of Temporal Goods in this Life, yet keep to the True Foundation which is Chriſt; and ſuch a man is ſaved (ſaith St. Auſtin) *as it were by the Fire of Tribulation.* Next he gives the reaſon of this aſſertion, as follows: *Quia urit eum rerum dolor, quas dilexerat, amiſſarum,* &c. Becauſe the grief he has for things he loved, torments him, yet ſhakes not the Foundation he is fortifyed withal; As who would ſay, he hath a ſence for the loſs of Temporals, yet the Foundation is not ſubverted.

Upon this reaſon: *Quia urit eum rerum dolor,* &c. theſe words immediately follow, *cap.69. Tale aliquid etiam fieri poſt hanc vitam incredibile non eſt. Et utrum ita ſit quæri poteſt; & aut inveniri aut latere nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatorium quanto magis minuſvè bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardiùs citiùſque ſaluari*: That ſuch a like thing be alſo after this life, is not incredible: What is not incredible? [Mark well the connection between *urit eum dolor rerum amiſſarum*, and the enſuing words: *Tale aliquid etiam poſt hanc vitam fieri non eſt incredibile.*] This is not incredible, that as ſome are puniſhed in this life, for their too much affection to worldly commodities, by grief for the loſs of them; ſo likewiſe it is not incredible, that they ſuffer a torment in thoſe purging flames upon that account: Of this particular pain, ſaith the Saint, we may inquire, whether it be a part of Purgatory, or no? whether faithful Souls find it there, or it be yet latent? Find what I beſeech you? *Quanto magis, minùſve*, &c. that by *How much more, or leſs they loved their periſhing goods, ſo much ſooner, or later they are ſaved, and come to Heaven*: Which laſt words plainly gives us St. *Auſtins* meaning, and ſhew that he doubted not of a Purgatory (which he here ſuppoſeth) but

but calls into qneſtion ſuch a particular pain, as is expiatory of leſſer tranſgreſſions. The ground of all is taken out of St. *Auſtins* Doctrine, who much inclined to this Opinion, that leſſer offences are uſually purged by the fire of Tribulation in this Life. So *Suarez* obſerves, *Tom.4. in 3. part. diſp.45. nu.23. Fine. Et ideo dixit Auguſtinus, hæc peccata leviora in hoc ſæculo purgari per Tribulationem.* And therefore St. *Auſtin* ſaid that theſe leſſer ſins are purged by Tribulation in this life. See his 41. Sermon *de ſanctis Tom.* 10. where he firſt diſtinguiſheth between great ſins, and little ones; then ſhews the penalty due to both: Finally, concludes thus of leſſer ſins (and he ſpecifies the too much love of worldly ſubſtance) *Ita peccata ipſa in hoc ſæculo purgantur, ut in futuro ille ignis purgatorius, aut non inveniat, aut certe parum inveniat quod exurat.* So theſe leſſer ſins are purged in this Life, that in the next the fire of Purgatory will not either find at all, or truly very little to puniſh. The Saint goes on: *Si autem nec in tribulatione Deo gratias egimus, nec bonis operibus peccata redimimus, ipſi tamdiu in illo igne purgatorio moras habebimus quamdiu ſupradicta peccata minuta tanquam ligna, fœnum, ſtipula, conſumantur.* But if in our Tribulation we neither give thanks to God, nor redeem our ſins by good works; we ſhall ſtay in Purgatory until thoſe above mentioned little ſins, like Wood, Hay, and Stubble be conſumed. Thus the Saint, who may rationally inquire, as he doth; yes, and affirm, that thoſe leſſer tranſgreſſions are uſually cancelled by the fire of Tribulation in this Life. The Doctor perhaps will ſay: Theſe Sermons *de ſanctis* are not St. *Auſtins*, for-ſooth, becauſe they pleaſe not his Lordſhip: Let him prove this Sermon now cited is not. The ſame certitude, ſaith *Bellar. de ſcript. Eccleſiaſ.* cannot be had of thoſe Sermons; yet credible it is, that for the moſt

part

part they are St. *Auſtins*. Be it how you will, they are of greater Authority then any the Doctor can give us againſt Purgatory. I hope the 2. Books *de geneſi contra Manichæos*, are undoubtedly St. *Auſtins*: Let the Doctor read the 20*th* Chapter of his 2*d*. Book: *Fine*; he ſhall find theſe words, *qui forte agrum ſuum non coluerit, & ſpinis eum opprimi permiſerit, habet in hac vita maledictionem terræ ſuæ in omnibus operibus ſuis, & poſt hanc vitam habebit vel ignem purgationis, vel pœnam æternam.* He that cultivates not his Field, but ſuffers it to be over grown with Thorns, hath a curſs on him in all he doth; and after this life, ſhall either have a Purgatory, or ſuffer pains for ever. St. *Auſtins* Books, *de civitate* were never doubted of: Read the 16. Chapter of his 21. Book, where he ſaith: If one be regenerated by the Sacraments of Chriſt our Lord (as by Baptiſm) and ſo paſs from the power of darkneſs, *&c. Non ſolum in pœnis non præparetur æternis, ſed nulla quidem poſt mortem purgatoria tormenta patiatur.* Hath not only any Eternal puniſhment prepared for him, but not ſo much, as any purging torments after death. Again, in *Pſal.*37. he diſtinguiſheth a double Fire, the one Eternal, the other he calls a Fire, *Qui emundabit eos qui per ignem ſalui erunt*, which is more grievous then any torment in this world: It would be endleſs to produce other Authorities for Purgatory.

Now to *Otho Friſingenſis* whom the Doctor cites *lib.* 8. *Croni. cap.* 26. and ſaith, *Purgatory in his time was got no farther then to a quidam aſſerunt:* Some ſay there is one. *Anſw.* The Doctor ſaith, He knows not what, and ſtrangely abuſeth this Author; Famous both for Vertue, and Nobility. In a word; The Title of that 26. Chapter is this: *Si poſt judicium extra infernum inferiorem, &c.* Whether after the day of Judgement any

any place for leſſer pain remains out of Hell, and what is to be thought of little ones who have Original ſin only. Thus the Title, which meddles not with Purgatory: The Chapter then begins; *His dictis indagandum puto ſi tranſacto judicio extra infernum inferiorem ad leviores panas locus remaneat; eſſe quippe apud inferos locum purgatorium, in quo ſalvandi, vel tenebris tantum afficiantur, vel expiationis igne decoquantur &c.* We are to inquire, ſaith *Otho*, whether, when Judgement is paſt, there remains a place for lighter puniſhment out of Hell, for there is place of Purgatory [*apud inferos*] amongſt thoſe that are under ground, wherein ſaved Souls are in darkneſs, and tormented with Fire. Then follows the *quidam aſſerunt* of the Doctor which relates not to Purgatory, but to that other place after Judgment, whereof *Otho* makes inquiry, and he anſwers negatively, *viz.* That ſuch a place, when all cauſes are heard in the General Judgment, remains not; though ſome Fathers inclined to think the contrary: See *Lactan. lib. 7. cap.21.* and *Origen Homil.14.* in *Lucam*, and theſe perhaps *Otho* impugned: Next he diſcourſeth how Infants, that dye with Original ſin only, are to be puniſhed, whether with a milder pain or no? Here is the ſubſtance of that Chapter. I could wiſh the Doctor would read thoſe words of *Otho*, towards the end of this 26. Chapter [*Quod ſi locus etiam ille ſuperior, non ut prius ad purgationem*] which manifeſtly declare the Authors meaning, nothing God knows contrary to Purgatory.

Pag. the 33. he cites *Maldonat*, alledging divers Greek Fathers denying that the Souls of the dead *ever do appear*: what is that to our purpoſe of Purgatory? *Maldonat* gives you St. *Auſtins* ſevere cenſure againſt them, and a proof is evident. *Moſes*, and *Elias* appeared

peared to our Saviour in Mount *Tabor*: *Ergo*, Souls do appear.

The Authorities he brings againſt Purgatory, pag. 34. are both ſo weak, and vulgar, that they deſerve no anſwer. *There is no place of Penance*, ſaith, he out of St. *Ciprian*, *There is no Effect of Satisfaction.* *Anſw.* Moſt true doubtleſs; for this life is the place allotted for wholeſome penance. In Purgatory there is no meritorious ſatisfaction. I ſee not where the leaſt ſhadow of a difficulty lyes in his next Quotation out of St. *Denis*, *Eccleſiaſ. Hierarch. cap.* 7. whoſe words faithfully rendered are theſe. *Thoſe that have lived holily, looking on the true promiſes of God, as if they ſaw the verity of them in his Reſurrection, with firm and true hope, full of Divine joy, go to the extremity of death, as to an end of their holy conflicts* τέλος ἱερῶν ἀγώνων. (to wit in this life) and therefore the Saint adds: *Becauſe they certainly know that all their conflicts for their future and entire Reſurrection, will be ſafe in a perfect and Eternal Life.* He goes on. *For holy Souls while they are in this life, can be changed to worſe; but in the ſecond Reſurrection by a likeneſs they have with God, they cannot be changed.* Thus St. *Denis*. Now let the Doctor make his Argument: Holy men relying on Gods promiſes full of Hope and Joy, conſider death as an end of their conflicts in this World, knowing a happy Reſurrection will recompence their grievances: *Ergo*, there is no purgatory or penal ſuffering hereafter. A moſt powerful Argument. Had the Doctor only reflected on what *Bellarmine* cites *lib.* 1. *de Purgatorio cap.* 10. *initio.* out of this very 7*th.* Chapter of St. *Denis*, he would never have troubled the Reader with ſo unweighty an Objection. *Bellarmine* relates St. *Denis* his words thus: *Accedens deinde Venerandus Antiſtes*, &c. *The Venerable Prelate, then coming, makes his Prayer over the dead*

dead, and that Prayer is to begg for Gods Clemency, that he remit all ſins done by the deceaſed party, through humane infirmity, and ſet him in a place of Light, and the Region of the Living. The ſubſtance hereof you have, *Bibliotheca Patrum ſæculo* 1. *Colen* Print Page 135. 1. *Columna.*

Next the Doctor cites St. *Iuſtin Martyr queſti. & Reſpons ad Orthodoxos queſti.* 75. ſaying, *That when the Soul is parted from the body,* εὐθὺς γίνεται *preſently there is made a ſeparation of the Iuſt and Unjuſt: the Unjuſt are carryed by Angels into places they deſerved, but the Souls of the Juſt* εἰς τὴν παράδεισον *where they have the Converſation of Angels,* &c. *Anſw.* Take notice firſt, how the Doctor varies from himſelf; page 29. Where we heard him ſpeak thus: *Sixtus Senenſis ſaies, and ſaies very true, That* Juſtin Martyr *did affirm, that before the day of Iudgment the ſouls of men are kept in ſecret receptacles, reſerved to the ſentence of the great Day; and that before then, no man receives according to his works done in this Life:* Here, *preſently,* the Souls are carryed into Paradiſe, that is into Heaven, If *Iuſtins* Authority be for the Doctors purpoſe, otherwiſe there is a third place. Theſe Souls therefore make a long demur, after their ſeparation from their body in ſecret Receptacles even to the Day of Judgment, and yet are carryed preſently into Heaven; Let him that can, accord theſe two Aſſertions; and learn moreover, that *Iuſtin* only ſays, the ſeparation of the Juſt and Unjuſt is made preſently εὐθὺς γίνεται τῶν δικαίων τὲ καὶ ἀδίκων ἡ διακρὶς, *but affirms* not, that all Juſt Souls are forthwith carryed into Heaven; if yet, εἰς τὴν παράδεισον in *Iuſtins* ſence ſignifies Heaven, and not rather another place, whereof ſee *Bellarmine, l.* 2. *de Purgat. cap.* 7. *& videtur mihi dicendum.* Be it how you will, at moſt this Ancient Father only points out the

two Final places of Wo and Happineſs, for two ſorts of men, which is no way inconſiſtent with an intermedial place of Purgatory, or *atrium Cæli*. Thus much is ſaid to comply with the Doctor, who cannot but know, that theſe Queſt. and *Reſpon. ad Orthodox.* are not *Iuſtin Martyrs*. See *Bellar. de Script. Eccl.* The Authority of St. *Ambroſe* next following, aſſerting *That death is a Haven of Reſt, and makes not our condition worſe, &c.* is an excellent ſaying; for worſe he is not, but infinitly better, that quit of the occaſions of living here, is acertained of future Bliſs hereafter; which is the whole drift of the Saint in that fourth Chap. *de bono mortis* cited by the Doctor. Read it, and ſay afterwards, whether I ſay not true.

The Doctor quotes again St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, in his 5*th*. Oration in *Plagam grandinis*; by his good leave 'tis the 15*th*. not the 5*th*. as I have ſeen in three Editions, that which I follow is *Paris* Print, *anno* 1609. pag. 249. his words, after he had mentioned the calamities of this World, are ἐῶ γὰρ λέγειν τὰ ἐκεῖθεν δικαιωτήρια, *&c.* I omit to ſpeak of thoſe great Tribunals in the next life, to which pardon and impunity in this delivers them; ſo that it is much better to be chaſtiſed and purged now, then to be ſent to puniſhment (to wit, thoſe Tribunals.) Now is a time of penalty, οὐ καθάρσεως not of Purgation: Therefore ſays the Doctor, there is no Purgatory; I ſay contrary, that the Saint ſpeaks not a word of Purgatory, but only denies a purgation of Life and Manners after thoſe Tribunals: The following particles (fraudulently omitted by the Doctor) make my aſſertion evident; for ſays St. *Gregory*: *As he that is mindful of God, is ſuperior to death, ſo to the departed*, (as holy *David* affirms) *Non eſt in Inferno confeſſio nec morum correctio, So in Hell there is no confeſſion, nor correcti-*

on

on of Manners : and he gives this Reason, because God here *shuts up both Life and Action with a final sentence of things done*, &c. St. *Hilary*, and St. *Macarius* speak only of the two Final States of Souls, and make no third place Eternal. Conformable to this, *Olimpiodorus* cited by the Doctor, speaks in *Eccles. cap.* 11. his words are *Biblioth. patrum Com.* 2. *Paris* Print 1624. pag. 670. ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν τοιγαροῦν τόπῳ, εἴτε τοῦ φωτὸς, εἴτε τοῦ σκότους, &c. *In what place soever of Light or Darkness; that is, whether in a filthy station of Wickedness, or a good state of Vertue, a man is taken when he dies, in that degree and order he remains for ever*; which is to say, great sins will abide with the damned for Eternity, and so Vertue shall ever remain with the Blessed; for says *Olympiodorus*, *He shall either rest in the Light of everlasting Felicity with the Iust, and Christ, King of All; or be tormented in Darkness with the wicked, and Prince of this world, the Divil.* Most true Doctrine; for there is no third place Eternal. The Doctor lastly cites St. *Leo Epist.* 59. for words not found at all in that Epistle: he writes to *Martianus*, and gives thanks for peace restored to the Church, by the Great Council of *Calcedon*. See this Epistle *Colen* Print 1561. Pittyful it is to see such strengthless Authorities produced, not only against the express Testimony of other Fathers asserting Purgatory, but more, against the sentiment of the Universal Church.

But I know not by what chance we have missed a former Argument of our Doctor against Purgatory: He hath it pag. 29. and speaks thus: *Sixtus Senensis saies, and saies very true, That many Fathers, as* Justin Martyr, Tertullian, *St.* Bernard, *and others did affirm, that the Souls of men before the Day of Iudgment are kept in secret Receptacles reserved unto the sentence of the great Day*, &c. Then he Argues: *if this Opinion be true*;

the Doctrine of Purgatory is falſe; or if not true, it is inconſiſtent with an Opinion of Fathers ſo generally received. Anſw. The Doctor hath not one true word in this Objection; falſe it is, that *Sixtus* ſo peremptorily aſcribs this Opinion to the Fathers, he rather makes it his work to interpret them favourably; and to do it, diſtinguiſheth a double beatitude, the one imperfect of Soul only, the other conſummat and perfect of Soul and Body; the firſt, the Fathers called by ſeveral names of *ſinus Abrahæ, Atrium Dei, ſub altare*, &c. the other, *perfect Ioy, the Glory of the Reſurrection, and entire reward of merits, a time of Coronation*, &c. And this later they held was not till the day of Judgment. Read *Sixtus lib. 6. Bibliot. Annot.* 345. in his two laſt Paragraphs *Hactenus & Demum*, where after a friendly check given to *Ockam*, he alſo takes off the charge laid on Pope *John* 22. for any Decree made by him againſt the preſent beatitude of Souls. Again:

Falſe it is that the Doctor exactly ſet's down in his Marginal Quotation *Sixtus* his words; more then half of them are not the Authors, who ends with St. *Bernard* at the particle *Præbuiſſe*; and our Doctor runs on, in one continued uniform Character, with a *præter citatos enumerat, &c.* yet there is not a ſyllable like them in *Sixtus*, and as they ſtand in the Doctors Margent are ſtrangely incoherent: Falſe, finally, it is, that though the Fathers held Souls as it were immur'd in ſecret Receptacles, therefore their Tenet deſtroys Purgatory. Why? they may have a Purgatory before they enter thoſe Receptacles: They may have it in *Origens* Opinion afterwards; yes, and if need were to aſſert it, puniſhed they may be for a time in thoſe very ſecret Cabinets. Divels are tortured, whether in the material place of Hell, or out of it; and ſo may ſouls be alſo, though

though we ſuppoſed (againſt Faith) our Purgatory were not, or no other then thoſe Receptacles. What I ſay here, is not in the leaſt to favour a condemned Opinion by the Church, but only to ſhew the Doctors weak way of Arguing.

CHAP. V.

The Doctors cavils againſt Tranſubſtantiation. His falſe Quotations. His impertiment Queſtions and weak Arguments.

THe Doctor in his 5*th*. Section, pag. 36. falls upon the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, where he bruſhes up a few old duſty Arguments anſwered every where by our Writers. *We know*, ſaith he, *the very time it began to be publickly owned, the very Council*, &c. *Anſw. Arius* might have ſaid thus much againſt the Conſubſtantiality of the Son of God with his Father, and made it a Novelty, firſt owned by the Council of *Nice*. The vulgar, ſolid, and true anſwer is; that the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation was ever believed in the Church, though more fully, and explicitly declared in the *Lateran* Council. I ſay, *was ever believed*, for if the moſt eminent Fathers that lived before the *Lateran* Council, told us *that Bread is changed out of his Nature into the Body of Chriſt: That by Holy Invocation, it is no more common Bread: That as water in* Cana *of* Galilee *was changed into Wine*;

wine; ſo in the Evangeliſt wine is changed into Blood: That Bread is only Bread before the Sacramental words, but after Conſecration, is made the Body of Chriſt. If Ancient Fathers ſpeak thus, (as moſt certainly they do, every Polemical Writer furniſheth you with theſe Teſtimonies) conclude we muſt that they either cheated the World into a falſe belief, or held as we do, the real Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. But my task is not ſo much to prove Catholick Doctrine (already done by innumerable Authors) as to ſhew you our Doctors faylings in his Quotations; page therefore the 37. he cites *Scotus*, ſaying, that before the *Lateran* Council, Tranſubſtantiation was not an Article of Faith, as *Bellarm.* confeſſes. Moſt willingly would I have the Doctor to point me out the diſtinction and queſtion where *Scotus* affirms this; ſome cite him in 4. *diſtin.* 11. *q.* 3. where he only ſaith (in all Editions I have ſeen,) that the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation was more explicitly defined there, but not firſt made an Article of Faith.

But the Famous (or rather infamous Quotation) is out of *Petrus Lombardus* (uſually called *Magiſter Sententiarum*) the Doctorhath it (to his diſgrace) page 38. after he had ſaid, that Tranſubſtantiation was ſo far then from being an Article of Faith, that they knew not whether it where true, or no; yes, and that *Petrus Lombardus* could not tell whether there was a ſubſtantial change or no.

I beſeech you mark an unexcuſable Error, *Petrus Lombardus, lib.* 4. *diſtinct.* 11. *lit. A.* begins thus: *Si autem quæritur qualis ſit iſta converſio, an formalis, an ſubſtantialis, definire non ſufficio,* &c. *If it be asked what kind of converſion this is, whether formal, or ſubſtantial, I am not ſufficient to define:* obſerve the word (*define.*) Then he

he ſets down ſeveral Opinions much in thoſe words the Doctor hath. To theſe Opinions, or Objections, where the Doctor leaves off fraudulently, *Lombardus* anſwers *lit. B. Quibus hoc modo reſponderi poteſt, quia non ea ratione dicitur corpus Chriſti confici verbo cæleſti, quod ipſum corpus in conceptu virginis deinceps formetur: ſed quia ſubſtantia panis, vel vini quæ ante non fuerat corpus Chriſti, vel ſanguis, verbo cæleſti fit corpus, & ſanguis, & ideo ſacerdotes dicuntur conficere corpus Chriſti, & ſanguinem, quia eorum miniſterio ſubſtantia panis fit caro, & ſubſtantia vini fit ſanguis Chriſti, nec tamen aliquid additur corpori, vel ſanguini, nec augetur corpus Chriſti, vel ſanguis*: To which we anſwer thus: Chriſt's Sacred Body is not ſaid after that manner, made by a Heavenly word, that 'tis framed a new in the Virgin, but becauſe the *ſubſtance* of Bread and Wine, which before were not the Body and Blood of Chriſt; by the Heavenly Word of Conſecration is made that Body, and Blood; and therefore Prieſts are ſaid to make Chriſt's Body and Blood, becauſe by their work, or Miniſtry, the Subſtance of Bread is made the Fleſh of Chriſt and the Subſtance of Wine is made his Blood, yet nothing is added to that Body and Blood, neither are made more, or encreaſed. Thus *Lombardus* anſwers the Objection which the Doctor only ſets down; and therefore in plain Engliſh he deals with his Reader, as Sr. *Morney Pleſſy* once did with Cardinal *Peron*; he gives you the Objections for *Lombards* own doctrine: that this is moſt evidently *Lombards* Doctrine, *lit. D.* clears all; chiefly towards the end: *Non ſunt tamen multa corpora Chriſti, ſed unum corpus, & unus ſanguis, ideoque ſive plus, ſive minus quis inde percipiat, omnes æqualiter corpus Chriſti integerrimè ſumunt; poſt conſecrationem ergo non eſt ſubſtantia panis, vel vini, licet ſpecies remaneant, eſt enim ſpecies panis &*

vini

vini, ſicut & ſapor, unde aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Yet there are not many bodies of Chriſt, but one only Body and Blood; and therefore though any take more or leſs, all equally, and wholly take the Body of Chriſt. After the Conſecration then, there is no *ſubſtance* of Bread and Wine, although the ſpecies of Bread and Wine remain, as alſo the taſt, wherefore one thing is ſeen, and another is underſtood. Never did *Lateran* Council, or any Catholick Author ſpeak more plainly for Tranſubſtantiation: To be ſure of what I here affirm, I have read two Editions of *Petrus Lombard*, that which was Printed at *Loven*, *anno* 1546. and the other, moſt uſual, with *Albertus Magnus* his Commentaries.

The Doctor next quotes *Durandus lib.* 4. *ſent. diſtinc.* 11. *qu.* 1. *Sect. Propter tertium*, who, ſaies he, *Publickly maintained that after conſecration the very matter of Bread remain'd, although he ſaies by reaſon of the Authority of the Church it is not to be held.* I Anſwer, That *Durand* in all that firſt queſtion hath not a word like what the Doctor aſſerts; read him Art. 3. he plainly maintains the Catholick Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, and abſolutely concludes that the Subſtance of Bread and Wine are converted into Chriſts Body. All he hath, *Sectio propter tertium* is, *that the words of Chriſt might be verified, although the Body were preſent with Bread*, which is a Theological diſputation, and neither clears the Doctor for his abuſing *Durand*, nor advanceth him one whit in his cavils againſt Tranſubſtantiation.

Page 40. and 41. he gives you a few weak Authorities againſt our Doctrine, and thinks to confute all by the Teſtimony of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*; cited page 42. *Orat.* 2. *in Paſcha*: The Oration is long, and the Doctor well

well might either by page or number have helped his Reader to find the place; but thus he deals with you often, and far worſe afterwards. Well, St. *Gregory* in his Works Printed at *Antwerp* 1612. *Orat.* 2. *in Paſcha* pag. 261. *nu.* 5. ſaith, *Iam vero Paſchalis participes erimus, nunc quidem adhuc typice, tametſi apertius licet quam in veteri; legale ſiquidem paſcha (nec enim dicere verebor) figuræ figura erat obſcurior.* Theſe words the Doctor gives you in Engliſh, and what conclude they againſt Tranſubſtantiation? nothing; for were the Sacred Body of our Deareſt Lord preſent in the Euchariſt, with the ſubſtance of Bread, were it (as it now is) really preſent without the ſubſtance of Bread; In St. *Gregori's* ſence, Chriſt *concealed* under the ſpecies of Bread may be rightly called a Figure of its own ſelf, more clearly hereafter to be ſhewed us in Heaven: For as the legal *Paſcha* was a Figure, becauſe it more obſcurely pointed out this true one in the New Law: So this alſo, where Chriſt Jeſus is concealed from our ſences, may be rightly called a Figure, becauſe it exhibits not moſt clearly that Saviour we ſhall ſee with greateſt clarity in Heaven. This ſence is gathered out of St. *Gregories* next enſuing words (which the Doctor wholly omits) *Figuræ erat figura obſcurior* (ſaith the Saint) *aliquam poſt autem perfectius, & purius, tum videlicet, cum verbum novum illud nobiſcum in regno Patris bibet, patefaciens & docens, quæ nunc plane demonſtravit.* The *legal* Paſcha *was a more obſcure Figure of this Figure which we ſhall afterward ſee perfectly, and with greater clarity; to wit, when the new Word ſhall drink it with us in his Fathers Kingdom, laying open himſelf, and teaching us thoſe things which now he hath fully demonſtrated.* Mark theſe laſt words, very uſeful to explicate other Authorities where mention

is made of a Sign, a Type, and Figure in this matter; but they are neither for, or againſt Tranſubſtantiation, unleſs the Doctor ſhews (which he ſhall never) that Chriſts Sacred Body is ſo barely Figured in this *Paſcha*, that it is not alſo really preſent. *Theodoret* and *Gelaſius* cited, pag. 43. are anſwered in every Book by our Writers. The nature of the Symbols, or Signs are not changed; that is, the Species, or accidents of Bread and Wine remain; theſe recide not from their nature: Grace is added. What is here againſt Tranſubſtantiation?

I paſs by thoſe witty queſtions which the Doctor moves, pag. 45. What if a Prieſt ſays: *Hoc eſt corpus meum, over all the Bread in a Bakers ſhop?* doth he turn it into Chriſts Body? the like queſtion is, And what if a Miniſter ſay the ſame words over the ſame Bread, doth he turn it into Holy and Sanctifyed Bread? may the People kneel down, and take this as Chriſts Body? Again, *whether a Church-Mouſe doth eat her Maker?* And what if a Mouſe, or a viler Creature had bit the Sacred body of our Saviour laid in *Bethlem* Stable, had they bit their Maker? Away with theſe Trifles, they become not a Doctor of Divinity. And be pleaſed,

To reflect on one doubty Argument he hath, page 46. which is indeed preſſing, but how? to ſhew that he knows not our Catholick Doctrine. *Since ſecondly* (ſaith he) *they ſay that every conſecrated wafer is Chriſts whole Body, and yet this wafer is not that wafer; therefore either this or that is not Chriſts Body, or elſe Chriſt hath two Bodies, for there are two wafers.* My God! what is here? out of two Wafers he inferrs two Bodies, as if one from the two parts in man, his Head, and Feet ſhould inſer a neceſſity of two Souls, or conclude there

are

are two Gods, one in Heaven and the other in Earth, becauſe Heaven and Earth are more diſtinct then two Waters. That known paſſage of St. *Auſtin*, *Ferebatur in manibus ſuis* in *Pſal.* 33. When Chriſt ſitting at the Table with his Diſciples, gave them his Sacred Body, (*Ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus ſuis*, ſaith the Saint) might well have learned the Doctor, that then there were not two Chriſts at the Table. Had he read what I cited above out of *Petrus Lombard*: *Non ſunt tamen multa corpora Chriſti ſed unum corpus*, &c. He might well have ſpared the labour of this Argument.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Doctors weak Arguments againſt Communion under one kind. Of his ſleight impugning Prayer in an unknown Language. Of his ill Quotations.

THE Doctor in his 6 Section, pag. 47. treats (as he calls it) of half Communion, that is of receiving the Holy Sacrament in one kind only; and beſides a few vulgar Objections ſolved by every Catholick Writer he has nothing. That which he alledgeth out of *Paſchaſius Rathbertus* ſuppoſeth a Law or practice in the Church for Communicating in both kinds: Would to God our Doctor had reflected on what this good Abbot hath in the beginning of his

19. Chapter, where he plainly acknowledgeth that the Blood which is in the Chalice is the very ſame that flowed out of the Sacred Side of our Saviour; ſo far at leaſt *Rathbertus* was a Papiſt, and never ſaid that Communion in both kinds is, or was commanded by Chriſt our Lord. Pope *Gelaſius* his Authority is ſo often anſwered by others, that I need ſay little. Briefly, to diſcern Catholicks from the Manich'es occaſioned that Law. Chriſt his inſtitution in both kinds, (figured in *Melchiſedeck's* Oblation of Bread, and Wine, and not a perfect Sacrifice unleſs Prieſts do it in both) is a moſt weak Argument to infer: Therefore the Layety is commanded to receive the Sacrament as Prieſts do in both. *S. C.* In his late excellent book againſt Doctor *Pierce* Chap. 12. demonſtrat's by the Teſtimonies of ancient Fathers, that Communion in one kind hath been in the moſt primitive ages a practice among Chriſtians. Thus much only I'll ſay, and end; if Infants once received the Holy Euchariſt in one kind only: if men of riper Age did the like in time of perſecution: if what the Fathers aſſure us of Domeſtical Communion, and the like of *Ermits* keeping the Bleſſed Sacrament in their ſolitude, (whereas the Cup was not given but in the Church) be true: (and moſt true all is.) Finally, if our Bleſſed Lord after his Reſurrection gave his own Body (going to *Emaus*) to his Diſciples, as divers Fathers teſtifie without the Cup, and they had their eyes opened: let the Doctor once open his alſo, and confeſs ingeniouſly that the Sacrament was in theſe caſes reputed effective, lawful, and laudible in one kind only. More I need not ſay, for its from my intent to handle this Controverſie at large: might I go on, I could tell him that ſeeing the Fruit of Proteſtant Communion is only to ſtir up Faith in the receiver; I can find no reaſon why their bit of Bread only,

ly, may not as well work that effect, as to taſte of their Wine with it. But enough of this Section.

The Doctor in his *7th.* Section, pag. 50. cites againſt publick Prayer in in an unknown Language that ſo often diſcuſſed paſſage of the Apoſtle 1. *ad corint.* 14. It would be loſt labour to repeat here what our Learned Writers have with all clarity anſwered; *I.S.* in his ſhort Treatiſe againſt Doctor *Pierce* his Sermon, pag. 89. and 90. ſolidly ponders that text, and ſhewes it makes nothing for Proteſtants. Next,

He cites *Origen lib.* 8. *contra Celſum* without either page, or number, whereas that *8th.* book with me, Printed at *Baſil* 1571. (and in a cloſs letter) hath ten whole leaves in *Folio.* However, the proof is nothing: The *Græcians* were to pray in Greek, the *Romans* in their Language; (both Sacred Tongues) what is this to the Doctors purpoſe?

Page the 52. he cites St. *Baſil lib. qu. ex ver. Scrip. locis q.* 278. we have three Editions of St. *Baſil*, and the laſt both in Greek and Latin Printed at *Paris* in two Tomes, and in no one Catalogue of his works do I find that Treatiſe the Doctor points at *lib. qu. ex.* &c. He would oblige me to direct me better to the Book. Next he cites St. *Chriſoſtom* in a long Homily without giving his words, and St. *Auſtin* in *Pſ.* 18. *com.* 2. (with me) it is *Expoſ.* 2. All I can find here to any purpoſe, are theſe words: *Nos autem* (ſaith the Saint) *qui in Eccleſia divina eloquia cantare didicimus, ſimul etiam inſtare debemus quod Scriptum eſt; Beatus populus qui intelligit jubilationem, proinde chariſſimi, quod conſona voce cantavimus, ſereno etiam corde noſſe, & videre debemus.* We who have Learned to ſing the Divine words (or *Pſalms*) in Church, muſt alſo be earneſt to follow what is written. Bleſſed are they

they who understand Iubilation. Therefore, my dearest, what we sing out with one voice, endeavour we must to know and see with a serene heart.

First, who are these *we?* Priests, and the Clergy that understood Latin, yet perhaps penetrated not the deep and latent sence of those Sacred Canticles. This saith St. *Austin*, *We are to be instant in, and not only to sing the words, but to know with a serene heart*, &c. I believe most of the Ministers, though they say, and sing these *Psalms* in English, are yet to seek for the very literal sence of them: good Counsel 'tis that all according to their capacity learn by an Interpreter, or otherwise somewhat of it; yes, and of the Mystery also. But to infer from hence: *Ergo*, these sacred words must be read in a vulgar Tongue in time of Church Service, is no consequence at all: though let me tell you, things well considered, the *Greek* respectively to the *East*, and *Latin* to the *West*, may be better called a known Tongue, (though not vulgar) then particular Languages of several Nations. *Spain*, *France*, *England*, *Germany*, *Poland*, &c. in the generality know *Latin*. But doth the *Spaniard* know French, or other People *Dutch*, or *Dutch* the *Poland* Language? not one among many.

The Doctor, pag. 54. rightly cites (which is a wonder) the words of the great Council of *Lateran*, *sub Innocentio* 3. *cap.* 9. but proves nothing with them. First, because the Several Rights and Languages there mentioned, cannot be shewed to be different from *Greek* and *Latin*, and in use *among those who have one and the same Faith.* 2. Admit they were different, the Church can upon weighty reasons dispense in her Law with Children of one and the same belief; at most then, here was a dispensation, which both supposeth,

and

and confirms the received Law. I ſay *at moſt*; for I read in *Binius* his Notes upon this Council, pag. 699. *primâ columnâ*, *Fine*; that the Patriark of the *Maronites*, who had abjured his Hereſie of the *Monothelits*, came to this great Council, ſubmitted himſelf, embraced the Catholick Faith, and believed as thoſe Fathers aſſembled did, *&c.* to him and his might well be granted the uſe of their Rights, and Lithurgy while their belief was one, and Catholick. Now let the Doctor tell me what Language the *Maronits* then uſed in their Lithurgy; if *Syriack*? it was Sacred, and ſpoken by our Saviour. What the Doctor hath out of *Quint.* pag. 55. is only to talk of *Gypſie* Language; we uſe no ſuch Barbarous Tongue in our Lithurgies.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Doctors cavils againſt Images. Of Antiquity approving their Veneration. Of the Doctors ill Quotations.

PAge 56. Section 8. our good Opponent ſpits a little Venom againſt the veneration of Images; The Poyſon he vents is caſt upon the moſt Ancient Fathers that have lived in the Church. Let him read *Euſebius Caſarienſis* (who lived in the third age) *lib.* 3. *de vita Conſtantini cap.* 48. *Paris* Print, where ſpeaking of the pious Emperour, he ſaith: *Tantus item, & divi-*

nus

nus amor animum Imperatoris complexus eſt, ut in ipſo palatii introitu in medio tecti laqueari inaurato, in tabulâ maximâ explicatâ ſalutaris paſſionis inſigne ex lapillis pretioſis polite elaboratis figendum curaverit. Iſtud Imperatori ſanctiſſimo regni firmum videbatur eſſe propugnaculum. So *Great, and Divine a Love poſſes'd this Pious Emperour, that he caus'd the Enſign of our Saviours Paſſion to be fixed in the very entrance of his Pallace, in the middle of his guilded Roof; and this, in a large diſplayed Table, curiouſly wrought with precious Stones. And this very thing ſeem'd to the moſt Holy Emperour a ſtrong Fortreſs and defence for his Kingdom.* Read St. *Baſil* in his Sermon of *Barlaam: Aſſurgite nunc mihi* (ſaith the Saint) *O clariſſimi Athleticarum virtutum pictores, & militis abbreviatam imaginem veſtris magnificate artibus*, &c. (and a few words after) *& pingatur in tabula ſimiliter & ipſe Agnotheta luctaminum, Chriſtus. Riſe up now ye Famous Painters of Champion-like Virtues; ſhew your skill in abreviating a Souldiers Picture: place alſo in your Table the Maſter, or Iudge of ſuch warlick conflicts, Chriſt our Lord.* If you deſire to know how Churches were adorned with Noble Pictures, you may read St. *Gregory Nazianzen Orat. 19. in laudem defuncti Patris.* The like you have in St *Gregory Nyſſen oratione de laudibus Sti. Theodori* before thoſe words: *Solet enim etiam pictura tacens in pariete loqui, maximeque prodeſſe. A ſilent Picture ſpeaks to us on the Wall, and profits exceedingly.* See St. *Auſtin de conſenſu Evangelii lib. 1. cap. 10.* St. *Gregory* the Great, *lib. 9. Epiſtola 9. ad ſerenum Maſſilenſem*, our venerable *Bede de templo Salamonis cap. 19.* and innumerable others: A Volume would not ſuffice for all: But you'll ſay, here is nothing for the Venaration of Holy Images. *Anſw.* I have often wondred why our good Proteſtants when they

they hear the name of Jeſus, bow in their Churches, and when they ſee his Picture ſcruple to do the like reverence. Well, for the Veneration of Images, beſides the definition of a General Council: (the Second at *Nice*) we have endleſs Authorities. I'll produce a few manifeſt ones which the Doctor ſhall never anſwer. St. *Baſil* the Great in his Epiſtle 205. *ad Iulianum* (read it in the ſecond Tome of his works, Printed *anno* 1618 at *Paris*, pag. 993.) hath theſe unanſwerable words: *Suſcipio autem, & ſanctos Apoſtolos, Prophetas, & Martyres, & ad ſupplicationem, quæ eſt ad Deum, hos invoco, ut per eos, id eſt, per interventionem eorum propitius mihi ſit misericors Deus*, &c. *I willingly admit of the Holy Prophets, of the Apoſtles, and Martyrs, and in my Prayer made to God call upon them, that by their interceſſion, God may be propitious and merciful to me*, &c. He goes on thus: *Unde & Figuras imaginum eorum* χαρακτῆρας τῶν εἰκόνων *honoro, & adoro, præcipue cum hoc traditum a ſanctis Apoſtolis, & non prohibitum ſit, quin & in omnibus Eccleſiis noſtris oſtendatur. Whereupon I honour, and adore the Portracture or Figure of their Images; chiefly when this adoration is delivered to us by the Apoſtles, and no where forbidden; but is manifeſtly ſhewed us in all our Churches.* What can be clearer? Now if you'll know how this Great Saint adored thoſe Images, none can tell you better then St. *John Damaſcen, lib.* 4. *Orthod. fidei cap.* 17. ſoon after the beginning of that Chapter: *Nam ut ille magna rerum divinarum eruditione præditus Baſilius ait, imaginis honor exemplum tranſit*, &c. *For as that Great Maſter St.* Baſil, *highly endewed with the knowledge of Divine miſteries, tell's us, The honour given to Images paſſeth to the Prototype. Bellar.* in his Appendix *de cultu imaginum, cap.* 4. *& paulo poſt*, hath this Authority of St. *Baſil*; but, as you may ſee, of another Edition, which makes it ir-

refragable. To avoy'd all exceptions of the Doctor, I here give you St. *Basil* in his own Language: δέχομαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους Αποστόλους, προφήτας, καὶ μάρτυρας, καὶ εἰς τὴν πρὸς θεὸν ἱκησίαν τούτους ἐπικαλοῦμαι· τοῦ δι' αὐτῶν, ἤγουν διὰ τῆς μεσιτείας αὐτῶν, ἵλεων μοι γενέσθαι τὸν φιλάνθρωπον θεὸν, καὶ λύτρον μοι τῶν πταισμάτων γενέσθαι καὶ δοθῆναι· ὅθεν καὶ τοὺς χαρακτῆρας τῶν εἰκόνων αὐτῶν τιμῶ καὶ προσκυνῶ κατ' ἐξαίρετον τούτων παραδεδομένων ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, καὶ οὐχ ἀπηγορευμένων ἀλλ' ἐν πάσαις τῶν ἐκκλησίαις ἡμῶν τούτων ἀνιστορουμένων.

My second Authority is taken out of *Athanasius* in his *interrog. & respons. ad Antiochum cap.* 38. *Nos Christiani non alia ratione imagines colimus nisi quem admodum cum filios nostros, & patres osculamur, animi nostri desiderium indicamus, sicut & Iudæus olim legis tabulas, & duo cherubim aurea, & sculptilia quondam adorabant, non lapidis, aurive naturam colens, sed dominum, qui ea ut fierent præceperat. VVo Christians,* saith he, *worship Pictures no otherwise then as we do when we shew great kindness, and affection to our Children and Parents; or as the Iews once worshiped the Tables of the Law, and the two gilt or graven Cherubs. They worship'd not the material Stone or Gold, but God; who commanded them to be made.*

I do not say this is the great *Athanius, valeat tamen quantum valere potest.*

The third is out of St. *Chrisostom* in *Liturgia*, interpret: *Erasmo. Sacerdos egrediens e parvo ostio portans evangelium, præcedente Ministro cum lucerna, & conversus ad Christi Imaginem inter duo ostia inflexo capite dicit hanc orationem,* &c. *The Priest going out of a little door carrying the Gospel, and his Minister before him with a Light, turns himself to our Saviours Picture; and between two Portals bows his head (before the Picture) and saith this Prayer,* &c. The fourth is out of St. *Gregory, lib.* 7. *Epist.* 54. *ad secundinum. Nos quidem, non quasi ante divinitatem, ante imaginem salvatoris nostri prosternimur, sed illum*

lum adoramus, quem per imaginem, aut natum, aut paſſum recordamur. we fall not down before the Image of our Saviour, as before a Divinity, but we adore him, whom we remember by his Image as he was born, or crucified.

The laſt is St. *Iohn Damaſcen's, lib.* 4. *Orthodoxæ fidei cap.* 17. *Quoniam nonnulli* (ſaith the Saint) *eo nomine nos reprehendunt, quod ſalvatoris, ac Dominæ noſtræ reliquorumque ſanctorum, ac Chriſti ſervorum imagines adoramus, atque honore afficimus; audiant velim quod Deus,* &c. *Becauſe ſome upon this account reprehend us that we adore, and honour the Images of Chriſt, of our Lady, of other Saints, and ſervants of Chriſt. I would have them know that God from the beginning made man to his own likeneſs; from whence is it then that we worſhip one another, but that we are made to Gods likeneſs?* Next the Saint diſcourſeth about the uſe of Images amongſt Chriſtians; and finally concludes thus: *Siquidem perſæpe uſu venit, ut domini paſſionem animo minimè verſantes, conſpectâ Chriſti crucifixi imagine in ſalutiferæ paſſionis memoriam redeamus, ac proſtrati, non materiam, ſed eum, cujus imago effingitur, adoramus. For it often comes to paſs, that when we are leaſt thinking of our Lords paſſion, by ſeeing the Image of him crucified we remember his Sacred Paſſion, and proſtrat adore,* (*not the matter of the Image, but*) *him whoſe Picture is there drawn out.* Thus St. *Damaſcen*, who with the other Ancient Fathers now cited delivers moſt Catholick Doctrine. I could wiſh the Doctor would teach his *people* to anſwer this one only Authority, and that of St. *Baſil.* In the interim let us ſee what our Doctor hath againſt Images, and their Veneration. We find, ſaith he, page 57. Images brought into Chriſtian Religion by *Simon Magus*; where I beſeech you? the Doctor cites *Theod. lib.* 1. *Hæreticarum fabularum.* St. *Auſtin de hæreſibus,*

reſibus, and St. *Irenæus*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 23. *Anſw.* *Theodoret* hath nothing like it, either under the Title *de Simone*, or *Carpocrate*. St. *Auſtin* relates at large *Simon Magus* his Hereſie in that book *de hæres: ad quod vult Deus*, but not a ſyllable is there that *Simon Magus* firſt brought Images into Chriſtian Religion. St. *Irenæus* in that book and Chapter now cited under this Title: *Quæ eſt ſaturnini argumentatio*: Relating how *Baſilides* held the firſt begotten *Nun* to be Chriſt, hath theſe words: *Qua propter neque paſſum eum ſed Simonem quendam Cyrenæum angariatum portaſſe crucem ejus pro eo.* Wherefore, he ſaid, that Chriſt ſuffered not, but *Simon Cyrenæus* for him who was forc'd to carry his Croſs: But not a word of *Simon Magus* his being Author of Images in that whole Chapter. *Simon Cyrenæus* was a different man from *Simon Magus*. *Well*, ſaith the Doctor, pag. 58. *theſe Fathers tell us that the* Gnoſticks, *or* Carpocratians *did make Images, and ſaid that the form of Chriſt as he was made in the fleſh, was made by* Pilate; *and theſe Images they worſhip'd as did the* Gentiles. My God! what ſtuff is here? *Carpocrates*, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, *who held that Chriſt was man only, worſhiped the Images of Ieſus*, Paul, *of* Homer, *and* Pythagoras (theſe the Doctor omits.) *The Gnoſticks*, ſaith St. *Irenæus*, (not in his 23. but 24. Chapter) *had ſome Pictures Painted, others of other matter, Dicentes formam Chriſti factam a Pilato illo in tempore quo fuit Ieſus cum hominibus, & has coronant, & proponunt eas cum imaginibus mundi Phyloſophorum*, viz. *cum imagine Pythagoræ, & Platonis, & Ariſtotelis, & reliquorum, & reliquam obſervationem circa eas ſimiliter, ut gentes faciunt. Saying the form of Chriſt was made by* Pilate *when Ieſus converſed with men; theſe they crown'd, and ſet out to ſhew with the Pictures of worldly Phyloſophers*, Pythagoras, Plato, Ariſtotle, *and the reſt, and honoured them juſt as the* Gentiles *did*, &c.

The

The Fathers here are exactly cited by me. And what is it that the Doctor concludes? Obſerve well: Theſe Heretick Worſhiped the Picture of Chriſt with ſuch an Homage as the Gentiles did their Idols; *Ergo*, Catholicks may not honor the Image of Chriſt, and his Saints with Relation to the *Prototypes*, and not after that manner the Gentils did their Idols, leaving out the Pictures of *Pythagoras*, and *Ariſtole*. Is this a good Concluſion? Had he given you faithfully the Fathers Words expreſly mentioning the Images of the Ancient Phyloſophers, the Reader would have ſeen the weakneſs of his Argument: But what will you? to make Images odious, Juggle he muſt, and conceal what is againſt him. *Epiphanius* cited relates the Hereſie of the *Carpocratites* as *Irenaus* doth, only he adds: *Habent eas imagines occultè, inſuperque Phyloſophorum, Pythagoræ, Platonis*, &c. *cum quibus Phyloſophis, etiam alias imagines Ieſu collocant, collocataſque adorant, & gentium miſteria perficiunt. They have theſe Images privately; and moreover, the Phyloſophers Pictures, theſe with other Images of Ieſus they place before them, and adore, and do the Gentils Ceremonies.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Doctors confus'd Quotations. Of Veneration due to the Holy Croſs. Of Picturing the Sacred Trinity.

THe Doctor goes on, and tells us *That Chriſtians and* Clemens Alexandrinus *declare againſt theſe things.* *Anſw.* And well they might, for I know no one will Patronize the placing our Savious Picture with the Phyloſophers, and worſhiping all alike as the Gentils did their Idols. Yea, but *Clemens Alexandrinus* ſaith, *We have no Image in the World, it is apparently forbidden to exerciſe that deceitful Art, for it is written, Thou ſhalt not make any ſimilitude of any thing in Heaven above.* Strange it is that *Clemens* ſpeaks ſo; certainly there are Pictures in the World, and as I have heard, a Crucifix in many Proteſtant Churches. Certainly the Art of Painting is not forbidden in *England* as a deceitful Art; for if one ſhould Paint the Sun, or Stars above in Heaven, is this prohibited? where then doth *Clemens Alexand.* deliver this Doctrine? *lib. 6. Stromatum* (ſaith the Doctor) and in his *Pareneticon.* *Anſw.* A ſtrange manner of citing. That *6.* book *ſtrom. Leydon* Print *1616* hath 58. pages in *Folio* (and a cloſs letter it is) the Greek on the one Column, and the Latin on the other, and his *paranæte* is within a page or two of the ſame length. Muſt I read ſuch Treatiſes over to find a Quotation thus

thus ſet down at random? What ingenious dealing is here? I have, though not very exactly peruſed that whole *6th.* Book, and cannot find this paſſage. *Clement*, page the 470. tells us that *God is not to be worſhipped as the* Græcian *Idolaters did, by any Wood, Stones*, &c. More I have not: Let the Doctor direct me to theſe words. *we have no Image in the World*, &c. though if found, the Latin I am confident (by what I read in *Clement*) will be *Simulacrum*, and the whole ſence relate to that of Scripture, *Non facies tibi ſculptile or* εἴδωλον an Idol.

He cites next *Origen lib.* 7. *&* 8. *contra Celſum* without either page, or number, or his words; yet theſe two Books *Baſil* Print 1571. contain 40. pages in *Folio*. In a word, *Origen* hath nothing againſt the uſe of Images, but wholly impugns the gods of the Gentils, their counterfeit ſemblances, their Idols; and declares our Chriſtian Doctrine thus: *lib.* 7. *contra Celſum num.* 18. page (with me) 789. *Nos vero ideo quoque non honoramus ſimulacra, quia quantum poſſumus cavemus, ne quo modo incidamus in eam credulitatem, ut his tribuamus divinitatis aliquid. we therefore honour no feigned Figures, becauſe we warily hold our ſelves from a credulity of aſcribing to them any Divinity.*

A few lines after *Origen*, he cites St. *Cyril* denying *That in the time of* Julian *the Emperour, the Chriſtians did give veneration to the Images, even of the Croſs it ſelf.* The Doctor here runs more at random then ever: which St. *Cyril*? *Alexand.* or *Hieroſ.* where? in what Treatiſe is this denied? I think he means St. *Cyril Hieroſ.* who lived neer the time of *Julian*, and hath in the end of his Catecheſis, printed at *Paris* 1609. a letter to *Conſtantius Auguſtus*, wherein he declares a ſtrange apparition of the Croſs ſeen in the Heavens by innumerable

at

at *Ieruſalem*, but not one word in it that denies Veneration to that Holy Enſign, but rather the contrary. *Beata, inquam, crux* (they are his words) *ſplendoribus luminis coruſcans Hieroſolimis apparuit*, &c. *The Bleſſed Croſs all luminous and glorious, appeared at* Hieruſalem, &c. Until the Doctor therefore directs me better to the place in St. *Cyril*, I'll tell him that *Athanaſius, de paſſione Domini Edit. ex officina Comeliniana, anno* 1600. pag. 808. highly honoured the Croſs. *Nunquid dignius eſt, & potius crucem adorare, quàm Iudæorum, & mundi gratiam lucrifacere. Is it not more worthy, and better to adore the Croſs, then to gain the favour of Iews, and of the whole World.* Again, the other *Athanaſius quæſt. 39. ad Antioch. eâdem edit.* pag. 286. *Crucem nobis fidelibus adorari, & oſculando honorari propter Chriſtum qui in ea pependit, manifeſtum. 'Tis manifeſt that the Croſs is to be adored and honour'd by us Chriſtians for Chriſt our Lord, who dyed on it.*

St. *Ambroſs* agrees alſo, *oratione de obitu Theodoſii* thus, *Colen* Print *anno* 1616. *Tom.* 5. page 60. *Sapiens Helena egit quæ crucem in capite Regum levavit, ut Chriſti crux in Regibus adoretur; non inſolentia iſta, ſed Pietas eſt cum defertur ſacræ redemptioni.* Helena *did wiſely, that placed the Croſs on the head of Kings, to the end it might be adored by them. Inſolency it was not, but Piety done to our Sacred Redemption.* St. *Hierom* alſo is conſonant, *Epiſt.* 17. *ad Martellam Paris* Print *anno* 1609. *Tom.* 1. pag. 156. *Ergone erit illa dies, quando nobis liceat ſpeluncam ſalvatoris intrare, & crucis lambere lignum? Will that day once be, when we may enter the Sepulcher of our Saviour, and kiſs the Wood of his Croſs?* Again, *Epiſt.* 27. *ad Euſtochium*, pag. 221. *Proſtrata ante crucem, quaſi pendentem Dominum cerneret, adorabat. Proſtrat before the Croſs ſhe adored, as if ſhe had ſeen our Lord hanging on it.*

See

See St. *Chriſoſtom* in a Sermon he hath *de veneratione crucis, Tomo* 1. *Paris* Print 1588. pag. 1331. none ſpeaks more ſignificantly: *Venit anniverſarius Dies omni religione colendus*, &c. *The anniverſary day of the Croſs is come, worthy of all Religious Veneration*: And a little after: *Quia igitur pretioſæ crucis venerationi conſtitutus eſt, huc adeſte omnes, cum metu atque deſiderio eam amplectamur. Becauſe therefore this day is appointed for the worſhip of the pretious Croſs; come ye all, let us embrace it with fear, with love, with affection.* Again, *Ejus pretioſam atque vitalem crucem adoramus, & pro theſauro magni pretji tenemus. We adore his pretious, and life-giving Croſs, and hold it as a Treaſure of mighty value.* Read St. *Auſtin* alſo *tractatu* 36. in *Iohannem, ante medium, &* in *Pſal.* 36. *ante medium*; you will ſee what veneration was given to the Croſs in his days. I cite not others in after ages, they are innumerable.

The Doctor, pag. 59. brings that often anſwered objection out of the Council *Elibery*, that pictures might not be in Churches. *Ne quod colitur, aut adoratur in parietibus depingatur. Leaſt what is worſhip'd and ador'd be Painted on the walls.* Mark; firſt the Council ſuppoſeth worſhip, and adoration due to Pictures. *Ne quod colitur, & adoratur.* Next it will not, that what is thus *Adored* and *worſhiped* be Painted on the Walls; either becauſe, as *Bellar.* obſerves, the Humidity of the place ſpoiled them, or becauſe they could not be ſo readily took away when the Gentils perſecuted Chriſtians; in Frames or Tables they might moſt eaſily. *Baronius* ſuſpects this Cannon to be ſuppoſititious, but there is no need of his anſwer.

The Doctor in the ſame page hath three places out of St. *Auſtin* to no purpoſe. The firſt is *de moribus Eccleſiæ lib.* 1. *cap.* 34. where he ſpeaking to the *Manichees*,

 ſaith

ſaith, *Novi multos eſſe & Sepulchorum, & Picturarum adoratores*, &c. *I know many honouring Sepulchers and Pictures; yet in life reprehenſible.* The ſecond *de fide, & ſymbolo, cap.*7. where he ſaith, and truly, that God cannot be circumſcribed in any humane form; and then adds *Tale enim Simulacrum Dei, neſas Chriſtiano in templo collocare.* 'Tis *wickedneſs in a Chriſtian to place ſuch a vain Figure* (*of God circumſcribed*) *in a Church.* The third is *contra Adimantum cap.*13. where he forbids *cultum ſimulacrorum*, which God prohibited in the old Law. What is here for the Doctor? who next hath a fling at the ſeventh Synod, or ſecond Council of *Nice*; *whoſe Acts about the worſhiping of Images were reproved by the Council of* Francfurt. An old, old ſtory anſwered a hundred times over. Let it paſs: yet I muſt not omit to ſay a word of what he hath, pag.58. out of St. *Epiphanius* his Epiſtle to *Iohn* of *Hieruſalem*, becauſe Proteſtants urge it much. The ſtory, which you may read in the very end of that Epiſtle is briefly thus: *Præterea quod audivi, quoſdam murmurare contra me*, &c. *Beſides, that I heard ſome murmur againſt me; becauſe when we paſſed to the holy place which is called* Bethel [*the Doctor calls it the Village of* Bethel, *for fear* [*I think*] *of naming a holy place*] *that there I might make a collect, according to the cuſtom of the Church, Et veniſſem ad villam, quæ vocatur,* and *came to the Village called* Anablatha: *and paſſing by, had ſeen a Lamp burning, asking what the place was, and underſtanding it was a Church, and entring to Pray. Inveni ibi velum pendens in foribus Eccleſiæ, tinctum, atque depictum, & habens imaginem quaſi Chriſti, aut ſancti cujuſdam. I found there in the entry of the Church,* (no decent place, but the Doctor conceals this) *a Veil hanging, dyed and painted, having an Image as it were of Chriſt, or ſome Saint*, for ſaith St. *Epiphanius*, *I do not remember whoſe*

whoſe Picture it was: when I had ſeen this, viz. *the Picture of a man hanging in the Church contrary to the Authority of Scripture I cut it in pieces, and gave Counſel to thoſe who kept the place, that ſome poor man ſhould be buried in that Veil.* Here is the ſtory; that which follows adds no new light to it for the Doctor. Now if all this were true, what makes it for the Doctors purpoſe? St *Epiphanius* cut in pieces a cloth Picture, the Image was unknown to him, whether of Chriſt or no, perhaps it was of ſome prophane man who was there honoured for Chriſt, or a Saint; *therefore*, St. *Epiphanius* judged that the undoubted Picture of Chriſt, and his Saints cannot be in Churches: No conſequence at all. But in a word, the ſtory is ſuppoſititious, and added to the Letter, as *Bellar.* Learnedly ſhews, *lib.* 2. *de Imag.* 9. *ad quintum.* Firſt, becauſe *Epiphanius* his Epiſtles clearly ends with theſe words: *Deus autem pacis præſtet nobis juxta ſuam clementiam ut conteratur ſatanas*, &c. Then follows *Præterea audivi* ſo harſhly and diſ-joynedly that one with half an eye might ſee the want of order in it. 2. Becauſe thoſe Hæreticks, who withſtood ſo induſtriouſly the uſe of Images in the ſeventh Synod, or 2*d. Nicen* Council, and objected all that could be ſaid againſt Pictures out of any Fathers, never ſo much as alledged this Teſtimony of *Epiphanius*, which argues, they either thought it not to the purpoſe, or which is true, judged it ſuppoſititious. 3. Becauſe *Epiphanius Diaconus* demonſtrated in that 7*th*, Synod, that two other Teſtimonies were falſly ſhufled into St. *Epiphanius* his Works by Hereticks: Add 4. that St. *Baſil*, and others who lived with *Epiphanius* had Images in their Churches, and reverenced them. Thus *Bellarmine*; and he hath yet more on this ſubject.

Either this ſtory is true, or falſe: If true, it condemns the Practiſe in *England*, for they have Crucifixes in their Churches; if falſe it is not to the purpoſe.

The Doctor in his *9th.* Section, page *61.* fiercely reproves the Picturing of God the Father, and the undevided Trinity: And liberal he is with the Fathers. He gives you a whole liſt of them in his Margent, but not their words, and he does wiſely; for their words would have taught the Reader how little they make for him: though I muſt tell you, that it is not ſo certain that Images may be made of God and the Sacred Trinity, as of Chriſt, and his Saints; ſome Catholick Doctors diſlike the firſt, ſaying it is only tolerated by the Church, not approved: None the ſecond.

Well, one Principle of St. *Iohn Damaſcen lib.*4. *Orthodox. fidei. cap.*17. (and St. *Auſtin* points at the ſame *de fide & ſymbolo cap.* 7.) ſolves all the Doctor hath, or can alledge in this matter. *Quiſnam eſt* (ſaith St. *Damaſcen*) *qui inviſibilis, & corpore vacantis, ac circumſcriptionis, & Figuræ expertis, Dei Simulacrum effingere queat? extremæ itaque dementiæ atque impietatis fuerit, divinum numen fingere, & figurare. who is there that can make an Effigies of, or Paint out the likeneſs of God, inviſible, without any body, without Circumſcription (that is immens) and Figure at all? Madneſs it is thus to figure a Deity, or a Divine Power.* As who ſhould ſay: He that goes about to expreſs by any Image the perfect Similitude of Gods intrinſecal Perfections, or his Nature which (is Immens) without body or figure, would be both impious, and act the part of a mad man; Yes, and as *Bellar.* obſerves *lib.*2. *de imag. cap.*8. *& proſolutione*, would make a very Idol. Such picturing of God, the Fathers now cited reprove; but if God, or an Angel appear in the form of a man, as he did walking in Paradiſe: why may not thoſe viſible, and circumſcribed Lineaments, be exhibited to our eyes? He was no Idol walking in Paradiſe, neither is he one Painted in Paper.

The

The Doctor pag. 62. after the Fathers, cites *Macrobius lib.* 1. *de ſomno Scipionis cap.* 2. The exact words of *Macrobius* are theſe: (after he had declared, what a powerful *Being* God is: *Quod ſciri quale ſit ab homine non poſſit*: that it cannot be known by man of what Nature he is.) *Ideo, & nullum ejus ſimulacrum quod cum Dis aliis conſtitueretur finxit antiquitas. And therefore Antiquity never made any ſemblance of him that might be placed with other of their Gods*: Exactly the ſame that St. *Damaſcen*, and other Fathers ſay. Next he cites *Nicephorus Calixtus lib.* 18. *cap.* 53. where delating the Hereſie of the *Iacobits*, and *Armenians*, the Doctor ſaith, *They made Images of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, which is abſurd.* Hold there good Doctor, you name one perſon more then *Nicephorus* doth: *Imagines* (ſaith he) *Patris, & ſpiritus Sancti effigiant, quod perquam eſt abſurdum. They made Pictures of the Father and the Holy Ghoſt, which is very abſurd.* And pray you, is it not abſurd to Picture the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt without the Son? Well, I anſwer: To Paint their incomprehenſible Divinity is moſt blameable; but not to Picture their viſible apparitions: neither doth *Nicephorus* affirm it, nay he ſaith four lines after: *Imagines ſacras honorant illi quidam, ſed non oſculantur. Theſe Hereticks worſhiped holy Images*, &c. *Ergo*, he held ſome Pictures Holy and Sacred, but this the Doctor mentioneth not; yet ſhuts up his Sect. pag. 63. with a weighty ſentence of *Polidor Virgil, lib.* 2. *de inventione rerum, cap.* 23. His words are theſe in the beginning of the Chapter, *Quo fit, ut cum Deus ubique præſens ſit, nihil a principio poſt homines natos ſtultius viſum ſit quam ejus ſimulacrum fingere. When God is every where preſent* (that is immens) *a foolery it is to make his Picture*: For immenſity cannot be circumſcribed. If *Polidor* means more

I care as little for his Authority as the Doctors.

Thus you ſee how one Principle out of St. *Damaſcen* (a moſt exact truth) ſilenceth the Doctor every where, though he cites ſo new an Author, as *Polidor Virgil.*

CHAP. IX.

Of the Popes Supremacy: Of the Doctors cavils againſt it. Of his deceitful and falſe Quotations.

THe Doctor pag. 63. Sect. 10. enters upon a large debated controverſie, the Popes Authority, and thinks with his four leaves, and a few old defeated objections to undo both Pope and Popery. He tells us firſt, *when Chriſt founded his Church he left it in the hands of his Apoſtles without any Prærogative given to one above the reſt, ſave only of Priority, and orderly precedency, which of it ſelf was natural, neceſſary and incident.* I would gladly know of our Doctor in plain Engliſh, what theſe minced words of *Priority*, and *orderly Precedency* ſignifie? or what could that one Apoſtle, (let it be St. *Peter*, if he pleaſe) do more by force of this *Priority*, and *orderly Precedency* then St. *Paul*, or any of the Apoſtles? St. *Peter* writ Canonical Scripture, ſo did St. *Paul*; St. *Peter* governed the whole Church, and had juriſdiction over it, ſo (ſaith

(ſaith the Doctor) had St. *Paul*; St. *Peter* could make Laws for the Univerſal Church, and was St. *Paul* limited in this Power? what then ſignifies this Priority, and orderly Precedency in one above the other Apoſtles? Let him declare this ingeniouſly, bring it to a reality, and prove it (as it behoveth him) by Scripture, and that very Place he cites ſhall prove alſo that *Primacy*, which Catholicks give to St. *Peter*.

In the interim be pleaſed to hear how pag. 64. he quotes St. *Cyprian de unit: Eccle.* for equality of Power among the Apoſtles, and deceives his Reader by concealing part, and depraving the whole ſence of St. *Cyprians* words: They are long and thus. *Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum. Ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus, & ſuper iſtam petram ædificabo Eccleſiam meam, & portæ*, &c. *& tibi dabo claves*, &c. *& iterum eidem, poſt reſurrectionem ſuam dicit, paſce oves meas. Super illum unum ædificat Eccleſiam ſuam, & illi, paſcendas mandat oves ſuas. Et quamvis Apoſtolis omnibus poſt Reſurrectionem ſuam parem poteſtatem tribuat, & dicat, ſicut miſit me Pater, & ego mitto vos*, &c. *Tamen ut unitatem manifeſtaret, unam Cathedram conſtituit, & unitatis ejuſdam originem ab uno incipientem ſua Authoritate diſpoſuit. Our Lord ſpake unto* Peter: *I ſay unto thee that thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church*, &c. *And again, after his Reſurrection, he ſaid unto him, Feed my Sheep: Upon him one alone, or only, he builds his Church, to him he committed his Flock to be fed. And although he gave after his Reſurrection equal power to all the Apoſtles, and ſaid, As my Father ſent me, I ſend you; yet to manifeſt Unity, he appointed or ſetled one Chair, and the Origen of this Unity he ordered by his own Authority to proceed from one.* (Now follows the Doctors words) *Hoc erant utique & cæteri Apoſtoli quod fuit Petrus, pari conſortio præditi & honoris & poteſtatis*,

tis, ſed exordium ab unitate proficiſcitur. Primatus Petro datur, ut una Chriſti Eccleſia, & Cathedra una monſtretur. what Peter *was the other Apoſtles were, endowed with like fellowſhip of Honour and Power, but the beginning comes from Unity. The Primacy is given to* Peter, *that one Church of Chriſt and one Apoſtolical Chair might be manifeſt.* Theſe laſt words, *ſed exordium*, &c. *Primatus Petro datur*, and *ſuper illum unum*, as alſo the precedent, *unam Cathedram conſtituit*, which clear all, the Doctor conceals. Is not here plain jugling?

This Primacy, and true Head-ſhip of St. *Peter* all Antiquity ſo amply confirms, that Volumes might be made of their Writings. See that Learned and ancient Author *Optatus milevitanus, lib. 2. adverſus Parmenianum*, page (with me in his works printed at *Paris* 1631) 48. *Igitur negare non potes, ſcire te in urbe Roma Petro primam Cathedram Epiſcopalem eſſe collocatam, in qua ſederit omnium Apoſtolorum caput Petrus: unde & Cephas appellatus eſt, in qua una Cathedrâ unitas ab omnibus ſervaretur, ne cæteri Apoſtoli ſingulas, ſibi quiſque defenderet: ut jam ſchiſmaticus & peccator eſſet, qui contra ſingularem Cathedram, alteram collocaret: Ergo, Cathedra una eſt, qua eſt prima de dotibus. ſedit prior Petrus, cui ſucceſſit Linus, Lino ſucceſſit Clemens, Clementi, Anacletus*, &c. The ſence is. *Deny you can not, that you know, that the firſt Biſhops Seat was placed at* Rome, *where* Peter *the head of all the Apoſtles did ſit, and therefore was called* Cephas. *This was done to prevent, leaſt any ſhould erect another Chair againſt it. The Seat therefore is one, the firſt of Gifts and Graces: firſt ſate* Peter, Linus *ſucceeded*, &c. And he gives you a Liſt of the other enſuing Popes to *Siricius*, who ſate in this Chair when *Optatus* lived. See alſo that known paſſage of St. *Hierom lib. 1. adverſus Iovinianum, cap. 14. circa medium*, in his works printed at *Colen*, *anno* 1616.

where

where after thoſe words which Proteſtants uſually alledge: *Ex æquo ſuper eos Eccleſiæ fortitudo ſolidetur.* He adds, *Tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur ut capite conſtituto, ſchiſmatis tollatur occaſio.* *Yet therefore among twelve one is choſen, that a Head being appointed, occaſion of ſchiſm might be taken away.* See alſo *Tertullian de pudicitia*, with me, page 743. printed at *Paris anno* 1641.) *Qualis es evertens, & commutans manifeſtam Domini intentionem perſonaliter hoc Petro conferentem: ſuper te ædificabo Eccleſiam meam, & dabo tibi claves.* *What a man are you overturning and changing the manifeſt intention of our Lord, who gave to* Peter *perſonally this priviledge? Upon thee will I build my Church, to thee will I give the keys*, &c.

See laſtly St. *Cyprian*, (to omit St. *Auſtin de Baptiſmo, lib.*3. *cap.* 17.) *Paris* Print 1648. (it is pag.139.) and 71. Epiſtle *ad Quintum*, where ſpeaking of St. *Peters* humility reprehended by St. *Paul*, he ſaith, *Nam nec Petrus, quem primum Dominus elegit, & ſuper quem ædificavit Eccleſiam ſuam, cum ſecum Paulus de circumciſione poſt modum diſputaret, vindicavit aliquid inſolenter, aut arroganter aſſumpſit ut diceret ſe primatum tenere.* *For* Peter *whom our Saviour firſt made choice of, and upon whom he built his Church; did not inſolently vindicate himſelf when* Paul *diſputed with him concerning Circumciſion, or proudly ſaid? that he was ſuperior or held the Primacy*, &c. Endleſs ſhould I be, if I held on with ſuch manifeſt Authorities for St. *Peters* Primacy, and Superiority even over the Apoſtles. If you would have more? *Ballarm.* largely furniſheth you; but none me thinks goes beyond a book Printed at *Paris*, *anno* 1553. the Author is a Lawyer *Remundus Ruſus* a moſt Eloquent, Solid, and Learned man that writ againſt *Molinæus*, and ſo pithily defends the Popes Authority, and ſolves

all Arguments againſt it; that I verily perſwade my ſelf, had the Doctor read him, he would never have troubled the World with his four forceleſs leaves againſt either Pope, or *Peter*.

My task is now to ſolve thoſe words of St. *Cyprian*, which the Doctor hath, pag. 64. *The other Apoſtles were the ſame that St.* Peter *was*, &c. add to them St. *Hieroms*: *Ex æquo*, &c.

One obvious and known diſtinction clears all; diſtinguiſh then, *inter Apoſtolatum, & Primatum*, between Apoſtles-ſhip and Primacy, and whatever the Doctor hath, or can alledge falls to nothing. The Apoſtles therefore were all equal in the Dignity, and Office of their Apoſtles-ſhip, or to ſpeak with ſome Divines, *quoad clavem Doctrinæ*: this is moſt true, and granted: But that they were all equal in Goverment, in Superiority, and Primacy ſhall never be proved, ſo long as thoſe words ſtand in the Goſpel. *Tu es Petrus*, &c.

You will ask, where I have this diſtinction of *Apoſtles-ſhip* and *Primacy*. I *Anſw.* Firſt out of St. *Cyprian* and St. *Hierom* now cited: *Hoc erant utique* (ſaith the firſt) *cæteri Apoſtoli, quod fuit Petrus pari conſortio præditi*, That is equal in this fellowſhip and office of being Apoſtles: *Sed Primatus Petro datur*: *But the Primacy is given to* Peter. Where you ſee, that *Cyprian* clearly grants an equality common to the whole Colledge of Apoſtles, and withal eſtabliſheth a Superiority proper to St. *Peter* only; either the words of this Saint are ſenceleſs, or the diſtinction of equality in many, and Supremacy in one muſt ſtand. And

In this ſence St. *Hieroms* Doctrine is moſt ſignificant, without gloſs, or wreſting one ſyllable: *Ex æquo ſuper eos*, &c. The ſtrength of the *Church was equally built upon*

upon the Apoſtles, viz. as Maſters, as Doctors, and Teachers illuminated by the Holy Ghoſt; yet therefore among twelve *One was choſen that a Head or Governer being conſtituted, all occaſion of ſchiſm might be prevented.* Here is certainly more then that Dimunitive *orderly Precedency*, our Doctor allows good St. *Peter*: *Ut ſchiſmatis tollatur occaſio* are ſignificant words, and point at what is moſt eſſential to the Church: The Unity of it. See the abſolute neceſſity of this Head in order to Unity moſt ſolidly laid out by *S. G.* and remember well what I was to ſhew, that St. *Hierom* acknowledgeth an equality amongſt many, and a Supremacy in One. Once more I repeat it: equality relates to their Apoſtolical dignity, Supremacy to the Head and Governour.

2. I draw this diſtinction of Apoſtles-ſhip in All, and Head-ſhip in One, from St. *Gregory* the Great, *lib.*2. *Epiſt.* 38. *indictione* 13. (ſo it is with me in his works printed at *Antwerp anno* 1572.) though others cite *lib.*4. *Certe* (ſaith the Saint) *Petrus Apoſtolus primum membrum ſanctæ & Univerſalis Eccleſiæ eſt. Paulus, Ioannes, Andreas, quid aliud quam ſingularium ſunt capita? & tamen ſub uno capite omnes membra ſunt Eccleſiæ.* St. Peter *is the firſt Member of the Univerſal Church, the other Apoſtles not ſo, nor in like manner Univerſal.* Yet with this Supremacy in *Peter* our Opponent muſt acknowledge an equality of their Apoſtle-ſhip.

I will add one word more, and tell you though the Doctor ſhould alledge out of ſome Fathers that St. *Paul* may be rightly ſtiled the Head of Nations, and be ſaid to have had a Principality over the Church, yet the difference between him and St. *Peter* is moſt remarkable. St. *Paul* and the other Apoſtles, had this Principality as Legats by *extraordinary conceſſion.* St. *Peter* had it over

the whole Church *in ſolidum*, yes, over the Apoſtles themſelves, as Paſtor Ordinary. I ſay *Over the Apoſtles themſelves*: ſo *Anacletus* Scholler to St. *Prter* cited by *Remundus Rufus* in *Molinæum* pag. 86. *Inter beatos Apoſtolos* (ſaith he) *fuit quædam diſcretio, & licet omnes eſſent Apoſtoli Petro tamen a Domino eſt conſeſſum, & ipſi inter ſe voluerunt id ipſum, ut reliquis præeſſet Apoſtolis, & Cephas, id eſt; caput & principium teneret Apoſtolatus.* *There was a difference a diſtinction among the Bleſſed Apoſtles, and although all were Apoſtles, yet our Lord gave to* Peter, *and the other Apoſtles among themſelves will'd the ſame thing that* Peter *ſhould be Superiour to the reſt, and* Cephas, *that is Head and chief of Apoſtleſhip.*

See this Authority more largely in the Cannon Law, *Decreti prima par: diſtinct* 22. *cap.* 2. and never leave of to wonder at the bold aſſertion of our Doctor: pag. 65. *viz. That by the Law of Chriſt one Biſhop is not Superiour to another: Chriſt gave the Power to all alike, he made no Head of the Biſhops, he gave to none a Supremacy of Power,* &c. So the Doctor,

In the ſame pag. 65. he fills his Margent with a cluſter of Authors, but to what purpoſe God only knows; if they be to prove that Apoſtolical power is, and ſhall be ever in the Church: We grant it to the Pope of *Rome*. If to prove that Biſhops ſucceed the Apoſtles in all priviledges, and ample power they had in the Church; not one Father in the Doctors Margent aſſerts it; though in a real ſence, Biſhops that have a true miſſion may be called the Apoſtles ſucceſſors, by reaſon of their duty which is, to uphold the Doctrine of Chriſt taught by the Apoſtles, by reaſon of their ſpiritual power, and Princely, and Prieſtly Dignity; and this is all St. *Irenæus* ſaith in the place cited by the Doctor, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 43. *Quapropter eis qui*

in

in Eccleſia ſunt Præsbiteris obaudire oportet, his, qui ſucceſſionem habent ab Apoſtolis. Wherefore we ought to obey thoſe, who are Prieſts in the Church, thoſe, who have ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles.

Thus St. *Irenæus*, and the other Fathers ſay no more.

I ſee not to what purpoſe the Doctor cites thoſe words of St. *Paul: We are Embaſſadors or Legats for Chriſt*, unleſs it be to prove what I aſſerted above, that the other Apoſtles, though Princes of the Church, were not Paſtors Ordinary, as St. *Peter* was? Leſs do I know, why the Preface of the Maſs (*Quos operis tui vicarios*, &c. is brought in: Paſtors they were, but all ſubordinate to St. *Peter* as I have ſhewed.

In his pag. 66. he jerks the Jeſuits, Monks and Cajetane, for defending the Popes Authority over Biſhops. But frivolous ſtories are but weak Arguments, yet the beſt the Doctor hath at hand. Next he cites Pope *Elutherius*, ſaying, *That Chriſt committed the Univerſal Church to Biſhops*. How good Doctor? That every Biſhop hath juriſdiction over the Univerſal Church? Tis very ſtrange! the Biſhop of *Down* and *Connor* will not pretend to ſuch a power. Chriſt indeed committed the Univerſal Church to Biſhops by parts, or portions, whereof the whole Church is made, yet ever with ſubordination to one head, which prevents ſchiſm, and conſerves Unity.

Page 67. he cites the famous words of St. *Cyprian. The Church of Chriſt is one through the whole world, divided by him, into many members, and the Biſhoprick is but one*, &c. No hurt in this, which makes againſt the Doctor; for if the whole Church of Chriſt be rightly called *one Biſhoprick*, there muſt be certainly one Head over ſo Vaſt

a Biſhoprick; no other can be but the Pope, who Governs in Eccleſiaſtical affaires. Other Biſhops have only a portion in the Flock.

He next cites you Pope *Symmachus* his words *apud Baronium. Tomo 6. anno D. 499. num. 36.* but falſly, for *Symmachus* writing to *Eonius* ſpeaks thus: *Nam dum ad Trinitatis inſtar, cujus una eſt atque individua poteſtas, unum ſit per diverſos Antiſtites ſacerdotium. As in the Bleſſed Trinity, whoſe Power is one and individual, ſo their is one Prieſt-hood,* (our Doctor reads *one Biſhoprick*) *amongſt divers Biſhops*; and thus he reads after he had thruſt in a Parentheſis of his own head, not in *Symmachus* his Letter. But the worſt is the inference he draws from *Symmachus* his words: *They being ſpoken* (ſaith he) *againſt the invaſion of the Rights of the Church of* Arles, *by* Anaſtaſius, *do fully declare the Biſhop of* Rome *had no Superiority by the Law of Chriſt over any Biſhop*, &c. A moſt weak diſcourſe! For admit *Anaſtaſius* had leſs prudently dealt with the Church of *Arles*, in changing the Ancient Cuſtom, admit a confuſion enſued upon this change; doth it therefore follow that the Biſhop of *Rome* had no Superiority over any Biſhop in the Catholick Church? Both Prince and Prelate may, out of leſs fore-ſight, make a Law damnable to their people; *Ergo*, they have no Superiority over them, is but a wretched concluſion, made by a Doctor of Divinity; who, if he had read *Symmachus* his Letter (and long it is not) he might have found the Popes Superiority aſſerted thus: *Relegentes ergo veterum antiſtitum*, &c. *dilectionem tuam enixiſſime commonemus, ut in ordinandis per ſingulas urbes, cana, ac reverenda ſervetur antiquitas, nec novella conſtitutio vetuſtæ ſanctionis robur imminuat. Reading what was anciently done*, &c. *We warn you, that in your Ordination through every City, Venerable Antiquity be exactly*

ally obſerved, and that no new Conſtitution impair the force of old Ordinances. Here are words of Power and Authority.

Page 68. he cites St. *Ignatius*, and before him St. *Denis*, two Bleſſed Saints, who in the very words the Doctor gives, ſpeaks not a ſyllable for him.

Next he cites *Origen*: God knows where, for he points to no place: Then he furniſheth you with Pope *Gelaſius* his Authority, and St. *Hierom*: The firſt ſaith he is, *diſtinct. 97. cap duo ſunt.* He miſtakes the place, it is *diſtinctione 96.* rightly cited thus: *Decreti prima pars. diſtinct. 96. cap.* 10. *Duo ſunt*: the words are theſe: *Honor fratres, & ſublimitas Epiſcopalis nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari, ſi Regum fulgori compares, & Principum diademati longe erit inferius. Epiſcopal Honour and high Dignity, cannot be match'd, though compared with Kings and Princes.* What makes this I pray you to prove that there are no intermedial Degrees, between *Chriſt*, and the pooreſt Biſhop in *Europe*? True it is, that the meaneſt Biſhop in the Church, for his Character, or Dignity of a Biſhop (preciſely conſidered) is equal to the higheſt; (ſo all Prieſts are, in reſpect of their Characters in Prieſt-hood) yet this ſhews not, but that one Biſhop may have a more ample power and juriſdiction then an other. I think my Lord of *Down* and *Connor* will not equalize himſelf with the Primative of *England* every way, though if he were a true Biſhop (as he is none) *Gelaſius* his words would be verified: *Sublimitas Epiſcopalis nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari. The dignity of a Biſhop is above compariſon*, &c.

Now to St. *Hierom* cited in *Ieremiam Homil.* 1 *anſw.* Doctor, *Ieremy* ſurely miſtakes St. *Hierom*: I have before me at this moment three Editions of St. *Hierom*, whoſe Com-

Commentaries upon the Prophet *Hieremias* are divided into 6 books, the Chapters handled, are the Prophets; but there is not one Word or Title, of any Homily *upon Ieremy*. I intreat him to direct me to that *7th. Homily*; and becauſe he cites alſo St. *Hierom adverſus Luciferianos*, which hath 8 *or* 9 *Pages in Folio, and* 8 *Chap.* I deſire he would point me out the page or Chapter. I know what he aims at, but becauſe the objection is old, it ſhall paſs until he pleaſe to be more exact in his citations. His fling at *Bellarm.* for ſpeaking Truth, deſerves no anſwer; nor that of St. *Cyprian*, which he cites in *Con. Carth.* for, who among thoſe he ſpeakes of, could with probability make himſelf a Biſhop of Biſhops? Or, by Tyrannical power drive his *Collegues* to an neceſſity of Obedience? No Pope pretends to this Tyranny.

CHAP. X.

Of St. Gregory's *refuſing the Title of Univerſal Biſhop. Of Fathers aſſerting the Pope to be Supream Paſtor. Of the Doctors faulty Quotations.*

NExt page 69. comes that ſo often anſwered objection, out of St. *Gregory*, who becauſe *Iohn Patriarck of Conſtantinople, called himſelf Univerſal Biſhop, ſaid it was a proud, profane, Sacrilegious, Antichriſtian Title.* And

it

it was ſo indeed in this Patriarck, who had no right to the Title, or thing either.

To clear the difficulty, be pleaſed to know, that this word *Univerſalis* may have a triple ſence: Firſt, it may ſignifie *Unum Solum ſingulare*, one ſole ſingular, ſo we ſpeak uſually, *Univerſalis Eccleſia, id eſt, una tantum, extra quam non eſt ſalus. One Church only Univerſal, out of which is no Salvation.*

Whoſoever therefore aſſumes to himſelf the Title of Univerſal Biſhop in this ſence, importing that he is the ſole, only, and ſingular Patriarck, and that other Biſhops are no more but ſuffragans, or delegates, is both Sacrilegious and *Antichriſtian*: Sacrilegious becauſe (engroſſing to himſelf the ſole power) he robs his Brethren of their true dignity. *Antichriſtian*, becauſe he oppoſeth *Chriſt*, who appointed Biſhops with their reſpective power and juriſdiction, to govern as ſpiritual Princes in the Church.

Now, that the Patriarck of *Conſtantinople* arrogated to himſelf ſuch an ample power, may be proved out of St. *Gregory* in that often cited Epiſtle to *Mauritius*. *Nullus* (ſaith the Saint) *eorum unquam hoc ſingularitatis vocabulum aſſumpſit, nec uti conſenſit. No one ever aſſum'd, or conſented to uſe that word of Singularity*: (and mark the reaſon) *Ne dum privatim uni aliquid daretur, honore debito privarentur univerſi. Leaſt whilſt ſomething is given to one privately, the General or Univerſal are depriv'd of their due honour.* And a little before: *Si igitur illud nomen in ea Eccleſia ſibi quiſquam arripit, Univerſa Eccleſia, quod abſit, a ſtatu ſuo corruit, quando, qui appellabatur Univerſalis, cadit. If therefore any one takes to himſelf that name in the Church, the Univerſal Church (which God forbid) muſt fall, when he that was call'd Univerſal, falls.* More to this purpoſe you may ſee *Apud Gratianum*

distinctione 99. But no where speaks St. *Gregory* clearer then in his 4*th. Book of his Epistles writing* to John. *Qui indignum se fatebaris ut Episcopus diei debuisses, an hoc quandoque perdidisti, ut dispectis fratribus, Episcopus appetas solus vocari. Thou who didst confess thy self unworthy to be call'd a Bishop, art now come to this, that dispising the Brethren, then coveteſt to be call'd the only Bishop.* Evident therefore it is out of St. *Gregory* that this ambitious *Patriarch*, with contempt of his Brethren, would be the sole and only Bishop, which is Sacrilegious, and Antichristian, and neither due to *Pope* nor *Patriarch*.

2. The Title of Universal may render you a sence that savors of Pride, Hautiness and Prophaness, and therefore as *Remundus Rufus* observes, it was often used by the *Roman* Emperours, and sounds high in the Greek Language. Be pleased to hear *Remundus* his own words: pag. 26. *circa medium: Et ille Ioannes cum Græcus esset, utebatur græca voce οἰκουμενικὸν πατριάρχην quæ non aliud significat, quam mundi vel orbis terrarum patriarcham, οἰκουμένη enim orbis terrarum est, & Latine* οἰκουμενικὸς *Universalis dicitur ut Pelagius & Gregorius interpretabantur. And* John *being a Grecian, used the Greek word* οἰκουμενικὸν *which signifies no other but Patriarch of the whole world, for* οἰκουμένη *is the Universal world, and* οἰκουμενικὸς *in Latine imports Universal, as* Pelagius *and* Gregory *did interpret the word.* This Title also, as *Secular* and *Prophane*, St. *Gregory* rejected.

3. The word Universal, or *Universalis Episcopus* without any ill sence at all, may signifie that ample Power, and spiritual jurisdiction which Christ's Vicar here on Earth hath over the Church: and under this notion, the Fathers assembled in the Council of *Calcedon* offered it to Pope *Leo* in these words: *Sancto, & a-*

mantissimo

mantiſſimo Domino Leoni Univerſali Epiſcopo Romæ, &c. *To the Holy and moſt belov'd* Leo *Univerſal Biſhop of Rome*, &c. Certainly, thoſe Grave and Learned Fathers cannot be ſuppoſed, either to have flattered the Pope, or given him a prophane Title, or the Title of ſole and only Biſhop, aſſum'd by *John* of *Conſtantinople*. Well, *Leo* refuſed the Title, and why? either becauſe it ſeemed new to him, or becauſe it had not been given to his predeceſſors by any ſolemn and publick Rite in former ages; or finally, becauſe the bleſſed man waved it out of Humility. Admit that St. *Gregory* did ſo likewiſe upon the like Motives, doth it follow that he yeilds up his Supremacy? No, he aſſerts this Supremacy over and over writing to *Mauritius*: *Petro Apoſtolorum principi, cum totius Eccleſiæ principatus committitur, & tamen Univerſalis Apoſtolus non vocatur; & vir ſanctiſſimus, conſacerdos meus Ioannes, vocari Univerſalis Epiſcopus conatur*. *When the Principality of the Church was commited to* Peter, *chief of the Apoſtles, he was not called Univerſal Apoſtle, and* John *my fellow Prieſt, endeavours to be called Univerſal Biſhop.* Now the Saint ſaith, *That he knows no Biſhop that is not ſubject to the Seat Apoſtolick.* Now, *That the Seat of* Conſtantinople *is alſo ſubject to him.* Now, *That it is lawful for none to tranſgreſs the Laws of that Seat. Nec noſtræ diſpoſitionis miniſterium.* Much more to this purpoſe you have in every Writer on this ſubject. The Authorities are known and vulgar.

This truth ſuppoſed: let us ſee the force of the Doctors Argument, which muſt be this, or nothing. St. *Gregory* refuſed the Title of *Univerſal Biſhop*: *Ergo*, he denyed his *Supremacy over the Church.* In anſwer, I plainly deny the conſequence, and ſay, that the Saint, by refuſing a Title which might ſeem new to him, and

which his Predeceſſors had not by ſolemn Rite, or finally, out of the motive of Humility, doth not therefore deny his Power and *Supremacy* over the Church, whereunto poſitively he laies claim ſo often. A *Principality* ſtands good, entire, and unſhaken, Though an innocent Title, harmleſly expreſing that Principality, be for ſome reaſon refus'd by him, who juſtly poſſeſſes the Principality. His Majeſty, *King* Charles *the Second*, is now abſolute *Monarch* and Soveraign over his Kingdoms, and is rightly ſtiled King of *England*, &c. Put caſe that either *Parliament* or People, ſhould go about to inveſt him, with a New Title, and call him *Emperour of England, Scotland, France*, and *Ireland*, might not his Majeſty refuſe this Title, (which neither adds to, nor deminiſhes his regal Power) without denying his *Soveraignity*? This is our caſe in St. *Gregory*; who, as he never laid claim to be *Sole Biſhop of the World*, nor to any *prophane Title*, ſo he never left off to maintain his due of *Spiritual Principality* over the Church.

Thus much is ſaid, in caſe it can be ſhewed that St. *Gregory* rejected the Title of *Univerſal Biſhop in the laſt ſence*, above mentioned: For by what I have yet read, he rejects it only in oppoſition to *Iohn*, or in that ſence, in which this ambitious Prelate laid claim to it.

The Doctor pag. 70. cites St. *Chriſoſtom in cap.* 1. *Act. Apoſt. Hom.* 3. Anſwer, St. *Chriſoſtom* treats in that paſſage of electing one in the place of *Iudas*, and hath theſe words. *Illud conſidera quàm Petrus agit omnia ex Communi diſcipulorum ſententia, nihil Authoritate ſua, nihil cum imperio.* (Nothing *by his own Authority*) which the Doctor more carefully, then ſincerely tranſlates (*nothing by ſpecial Authority*) intimating, (as I conceive) no ſpecial Authority given to St. *Peter*, whereas thoſe words *Nothing*

thing by his own Original Authority οὐδὲν αὐθεντικῶς evidently suppose, both Power and Authority in St. *Peter*: for no Prince can properly be said not to do a thing by his own Authority only, (but with the advise of his Counsel) unless he be supposed to have Authority: which is here evidenced in St. *Peter*, by the next ensuing words of St. *Chrisostom*. *Neque simpliciter dixit, hunc in locum Iudæ sufficimus, sed consolans illos*, &c. As who should say, *St.* Peter *used not the Power he had in this Election, but rather sought the comfort of his fellow Disciples, who were much disanimated at the fall of* Judas. Here, by the way, observe a most weak kind of arguing in our Doctor. St. *Peter did all* in *this particular* by common consent of the Apostles, nothing by his own Power, or Command, *Ergo*, he had not the Power: why? because he used it not. Is this a tollerable discourse? A Prince concludes of some weighty Affair, by, and with the advice of his counsel, not by his own Authority: *Ergo*, he hath not this Power; Doth the not actual using of Power and Authority either imply, or argue the *not having of it*? Toyes. Had our good Doctor but cast his Eyes upon St. *Chrisostom's* Doctrine, delivered a few lines above the place now quoted, he would have found St. *Peters* Authority made good in these words: *Quàm est fervidus? Quàm agnoscit creditum a Christo gregem? Quàm in hoc choro princeps est? & ubique primus omnium incipit loqui. How fervent is St.* Peter? *How doth he acknowledge, or own the Flock committed to him by Christ? In this assembly he was Prince, and chief, and every where, first of all begins to speak.* Here is enough to silence the Doctor.

See the Supremacy of St. Peter *amply confirmed by St.* Chrisostom *upon the Acts, even in Sir* Henry Savils Edition Tom. 4. pag. 624. *and* 625. *cheifly at those words* τί οὖν ἐλέσθαι n. 22. Again n. 26. καὶ ὅρα τὴν ἐπιείκειαν ἰακώβου &c. *Afterwards* pag. 625. *at those words* Εἰκότως πρῶτος τοῦ πράγματος αὐθεντεῖ, &c.

Who

Who cites next *Melchior Canus de locis Theolog. lib. 6. cap. 8. There is* (ſaith he) *no Scripture, no Revelation that the Biſhop of Rome ſhould ſucceed St.* Peter *in it.* Anſwer, Here is an Emphaſis too much: (*no Scripture, no Revelation*) and that left out of *Canus* which moderates all. *Canus* his words are theſe. *Illud quoque magnopere advertendum eſt, Romanum Pontificem Petro ſuccedere, non eſſe (per ſe quidem) in ſacris literis revelatum, ſed aliunde conſtare, ex eo ſcilicet, quod graviſſimæ hiſtoriæ prodidere, Petrum Apoſtolum ſuam Cathedram Romæ demum collocaſſe, ibique cum eſſet, Epiſcopum fuiſſe defunctum.* 'Tis much to be reflected on: That the Biſhop of Rome *ſucceeds* Peter, *is not indeed* (*by its ſelf*) *reveal'd in Scripture, but is manifeſted by other means; to wit, by moſt grave Hiſtory, that hath left on Record, that Bleſſed St.* Peter *placed his Chair at* Rome, *and when he was there, dyed Biſhop of that place*; For this, *Canus* cites you eighteen or nineteen of the moſt Ancient Fathers that lived in the Church, as St. *Denis*, *Clemens*, *Anacletus*, *Tertullian*, St. *Hierom*, St. *Auſtin*, *&c.* and finally concludes: *Tam vero multis, & incorruptis teſtibus qui non credit, is aut ſtultum, aut hæreticum ſe eſſe demonſtrat. He who gives not credit to ſo many, and ſincere witneſſes, either ſhews himſelf a Fool, or an Heretick.* Now mark the diſingenious dealing of our Doctor with *Canus* who to make his words ſound loud for the Proteſtants purpoſe, fraudulently omits theſe particulars, (*non eſſe per ſe quidem*) which abates much, and turns them out of that furious ſence the Doctor gives. [*There is no Scripture* (ſaith he) *no Revelation, that the Biſhop of* Rome *ſhould ſucceed* Peter.] *Canus* ſpeaks thus, and moderately: *That the Biſhop of* Rome *does ſucceed* Peter, *is not by it ſelf preciſely, or in expreſs terms revealed in Scripture*; which

Will the Doctor ſtand to this Biſhops Judgment? what thinks he of this determination of the Queſtion?

which hath Truth in it, for the Biſhop of *Rome per ſe*, or in formal expreſs terms is not named in Scripture: Yet, neither *Canus*, nor any can doubt but that this ſucceſſion of the *Roman Biſhop* is evidently deduced out of Scripture, though not *per ſe revelatum*.

Were the Doctor verſed in School Divinity, or knew how preciſely School-men ſpeak, when they inquire what is *per ſe*, *by it ſelf immediately*, or *in formal terms* revealed: I could tell him that *Canus* his words deſerved more, then totally to be omitted by him. Put caſe it were revealed *per ſe*, that a man is *animal rationale*, *a reaſonable creature*; it follows by evident diſcourſe, he is alſo *riſibilis*, *riſible*: Yet, I know many Divines, (and *Canus* may be one) who ſay, that the *man is riſible*; is not *per ſe* revealed; why? becauſe this is not *per ſe*, or in expreſs terms affirmed by the Revelation, though drawn from thence by good conſequence. But enough of theſe ſubtilties, they are not for the Doctor.

After *Canus* he cites Cardinal *Cuſanus* and *Soto* affirming, as he ſays, that *This ſucceſſion was not addicted to any particular Church*, &c. Anſw. Firſt, *Nicolaus de Cuſa*, or Cardinal *Cuſanus* writ that Treatiſe *de Concordantiâ Catholicâ* when he was a young man, about the beginning of the *Council of Baſil*, and as *Bellar.* obſerves, to exalt the Authority of the Council, too much depreſſed the See Apoſtolick; but afterwards ſeeing his error, and how the Schiſms grew on, he oppoſed it, and ſtood earneſtly for the See Apoſtolick, as you may ſee in that Epiſtle writ to *Rodericus Trevinus*; you have it in *Cuſanus* his works printed at *Baſil* page 825. *anno* 1442. [20. *May* the Letter was dated.]

2. *Cuſanus* ſpeaks not ſo abſolutely as the Doctor makes

makes him, for although he ſaid, *Si per poſſibile, Trevirenſis Archiepiſcopus per Eccleſiam congregatam*, &c. *If poſſible the Arch-biſhop of* Trevers *were by the Church aſſembled, choſen for Head and Governor, he would be more the ſucceſſor of* Peter *then the Roman Biſhop*: Yet he adds this mitigation: *Licet credendum ſit Romanum Pontificem, ſicut locum Petri, ita & principatum nunquam perditurum. Although it is to be believed, that the Roman Biſhop, as he will never loſe the place of* Peter, *ſo he will never loſe his Principality.* This the Doctor thought fit to conceal.

Dominicus Soto, in the place cited by the Doctor, *ſed forſan*, ſtifly defends the Succeſſion of the *Roman Biſhop* to St. *Peter*: *Verba ipſa* (ſaith he) *tu es Petrus, & ſuper hunc*, &c. *& paſce oves meas, palam demonſtrant illa ratione Eccleſiam, uſque ad poſtremum diem orbis duraturam, fundaſſe, ut Petri ſucceſſores, perinde ac Petrus ipſe, vice Chriſti fungerentur: atque adeo unuſquiſque eorum ſummum in Eccleſia faſtigium teneret. Thoſe words, Thou art* Peter; *and feed my Sheep; evidently demonſtrate the Church founded in ſuch a manner to the end of the world, that the Succeſſors of* Peter *as well as* Peter *himſelf be in the place of Chriſt, and every one of them hold Supreme Authority in the Church of Chriſt.* It is true *ſed. Duo ergo* (he ſaith) *rem eſſe impendio decentiſſimam ut Romana ſedes Petri ſanguine decorata ſit ſedes ſucceſſorum Petri. It is moſt decent that the Roman See honoured with the blood of* Peter, *be the place of all the Succeſſors of* Peter: And then adds: *Hac non obſtante veritate, nulla profecto ex Evangelio prohibitio plane colligitur, quo minus poſſet Eccleſiæ conſtitutione fieri ut Epiſcopus ſedem ſuam ab urbe demutaret: Imo ut nullam ſibi particularem applicaret, cujus diceretur Antiſtes, ſed eſſet univerſalis mundi Epiſcopus cui omnes particulares ſubjicerentur. Notwithſtanding this Truth, there is no clear Prohibi-*

tion

tion in the Goſpel, forbidding (if the Church appoint ſo) that the Biſhop of Rome *change his Seat, yes, and apply no other particular one to himſelf, of which he may be called Biſhop and yet* he would be the Univerſal Biſhop of the World: *to whom all particulars ought to be ſubject.*

See now how little the Doctor hath got out of theſe two Authors: *Cuſanus* ſaith, that if by any poſſibility the Biſhop of *Trevers* were by the Votes of the Church, Head of it; he would have Univerſal juriſdiction over the Church, as the Pope hath now; (for *Cuſanus* ever defended this ample Authority of the *Pope*.) *Sato* ſaith, that it is not *plane*, *fully*, *clearly*, forbid in the Goſpel, that the *Biſhop of Rome* change his See, yet if he did ſo, he would be ſtill the *Univerſal Biſhop of the World*; to whom all were ſubject, even the Biſhop of *Down* and *Connor*. Now here is that which vexeth our Doctor, *viz.* that one man have ſuch an ample command, and Authority over all: Put caſe, *Per impoſſibile*, (ſay I) that the *Biſhop of Trevers* were elected *Pope*, (*qua Trevirenſis*) with the ſame ample Power and juriſdiction that the Pope ever had, and that the *Roman Biſhop* were laid aſide: our good Doctor would even then, ſtorm as much againſt *Trevers* Pope, as he now doth againſt the *Roman*. It is not, God knows, the place or perſon that he ſo furiouſly oppoſeth, but the Power and Dignity annexed, to what See ſoever. This gives him regret.

Next he ſaith, *It cannot be proved that the Biſhop of* Rome. *is Prince of the Church*; And I think by his Marginal citation he directs me to *Ioannes Driedo de dogm. lib.* 4. *cap.* 3. This Chapter hath 13. or 14. Leaves in *Folio*, and three parts in it. The Doctor might well have quoted the part, had he ever read *Driedo*: But let that paſs. I anſwer, *Driedo* hath nothing for the Doctors purpoſe, but expreſly the contrary: thus:

part. 2. cap. 3. Folio with me, 227. *Primus Simon qui dicitur Petrus*, Mat. 10 — *Hoc autem non potest intelligi, quod Petrus fuerit primus tempore, aut vocationis ordine, quoniam Andreas prius secutus est Christum, quam Petrus*, &c. *dicitur ergo Petrus esse primus Apostolorum, dignitate, & prælationis potestate. St.* Mathew *reckons of St.* Peter *as first, But this cannot* (saith *Driedo*) *be understood that* Peter *was first called, for* Andrew *was before him and first followed Christ*: Peter *therefore is stiled the first of the Apostles, because of his Dignity and Power of Superiority.* And this Principality *Driedo* earnestly maintains, not only in St. *Peter*, but in every lawful elected Bishop of *Rome. Vide folium* 229. *Part* 2. *Omnes* (saith he) *ab initio Ecclesiastici Pontifices, Patres, Martyres, & Universalis Ecclesiæ concilia, honoraverunt Romanæ Ecclesiæ Pontificem, tanquam supremum & Universalis Ecclesiæ Episcopum. All Bishops from the beginning, The Fathers, Martyrs, and Councils of the Universal Church, have ever honoured the Pope of* Rome *as the Supreme Bishop of the Universal Church.* And here is enough of the Doctors 10*th.* Section, for what he saith of the *African* Fathers opposing the *Pope* is handled so often, that 'tis time lost to repeat it: So also is that which he hints at, out of the Council of *Calcedon* giving equal Rights, and Preheminency with *Rome* to the *Patriarck of Constantinople.* I answer briefly, This is most untrue, the very Decree, were it Authentical, gives him only the second place, as is manifest by these words: *Secundam post illam existere*: that is, next after *Rome*: I say, *if the Decree were Authentical*, for it was both clancular, and surreptitious, procured by *Anatolius* and his Confederates while the *Popes Legates* were absent. This manifestly appears both by *Pope Leo* his Letters to *Anatolius*, and the attestation of the whole *Council*, which I have read more then once, and am

ready

ready to maintain what I ſay againſt Dr. *Taylor*, or any body elſe.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Doctors harſh Doctrine concerning ſpeedy repentence after ſin. Of his miſtakes, and wronging Authors.

IN his 11*th*. *Section*, pag. 71. he hath little worth notice a croud of Controverſies you have, ſuperficially run over *E. G. Invocation of Saints, inſufficiency of Scripture: Nine penny Maſſes*: and I know not what, lightly are they touched on by him without proof, and let them on Gods name as lightly paſs without anſwer.

Page 72. he cites the Cannon Law *de conſecrat. diſtinct. c. peracta.* where it is ſaid, that *Conſecration finiſhed, all are to Communicat*, &c. *for ſo the Apoſtles appointed, and the Church of* Rome *holds*. Had the Doctor read the Marginal gloſs upon this Chapter, he might have ſeen, that this Ancient Law is now no more in force, and this by the permiſſion of the Church, obliging only to Communicate once a year. O, but the Apoſtles appointed it: So they alſo appointed, *Act.* 15. *v.* 20. *To abſtain a ſuffocatis, & ſanguine, from ſtrangled meat and blood*; Doth the Doctor comply with this precept? Every poſitive Law, even of the Apoſtles, had not always force in after ages. I wonder he cites this Law

againſt us, while Proteſtants themſelves do not obſerve it: doth every one, that is preſent at ſervice, Communicate when the Miniſter makes his *Cæna*? but what will you? there is neither Conſecration nor Communion. The reſt that follows in this Section is moſt empty ſtuff.

Page 75. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 1. he much reprehends Catholick Doctors, who teach *that a ſinner is not bound preſently to repent of his ſin, as ſoon as he hath committed it.* He adds, pag. 76. *Though the Church calls on ſinners to repent on Holy days, or at Eaſter; yet that by the Law of God, they are not tyed to ſo much, but only to repent in the danger or article of Death.* (*Mark the word only.*) And for this Doctrine he cites the *Famous Navar*, in his *Enchir*, or *Manual*, *cap.* 1. *num.* 31. *Anſw.* I ſee he never read *Navar*, for he neither gives you the Right number, nor his Doctrine exactly; the number, with me in his Manual printed at *Antwerp* 1601. is, *num.* 27. The Doctrine thus, after *Navar* had declared that the other two affirmative precepts of *Baptiſm* and *confeſſion* do not oblige under pain of a new ſin but in time of neceſſity: *Ita*, ſaith he, *per conſequutionem, præceptum affirmativum de ſe convertendo, non obligat ſub pœna novi peccati Lethalis niſi in articulo neceſſitatis; in illo vero ſic: quamobrem ad prædictam pœnitudinem concipiendam tenebimur imminente articulo mortis naturalis, vel violentæ, vel adminiſtrandi, ſuſcipiendique aliquod ſacramentum, imo etiam inſtante populi neceſſitate aliqua grandi, cui abſque orationis fervore provideri non poſſet.* So by conſequence, *the affirmative præcept of converting one ſelf, doth not oblige under pain of a new mortal ſin but in time of neceſſity, and in that Article thus: wherfore bound we are to repent in the imminent Article of death natural or violent, or when we receive any Sacrament, or any danger, or great neceſſity preſſes on us, not to be preven-*

ted

ted, but by ardent Prayer, &c. Perhaps the Doctor will ſay, that theſe two laſt caſes of the *Sacrament*, or great neceſſity, *Per accidens*, accidently oblige a ſinner to contrition. Be it ſo, yet *Natar* ſaith not ſo much, at leaſt he doth not ſay, that a ſinner is obliged *only* to repent in the hour of his death. It is one thing to oblige a ſinner to repent, when he is ready to dye, and another to ſay, he is *only* then obliged. All ſinners are certainly bound to repent then, yet many great Divines add to this a further obligation, and affirm that, *aliquoties in vita*, for ſome time in their life, this Obligation lies on them.

I cannot but ſmile reading our Doctor, pag. 76. (whoſe whole aim is to ſhew out of our Authors, that repentance is never neceſſary but in the hour of death *only*) to ſee how unwarily he ſpeaks from his own purpoſe, while he makes *Renaldus* to ſay, *that a ſinner is obliged to repent* (which is undoubtedly true.) He cites him, *Prax. Fori. Pæn. lib.* 5. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 4. *n.* 23. In Engliſh thus: *It is true, and the Opinion of all men, that the time in which a ſinner is bound by the commandment of God to be contrite for his ſins, is the imminent Article of natural or violent death.* Let every ingenious Reader ponder theſe Engliſh words till Dooms-day, and ſay afterwards whether he can force any other ſence out of them, but this aſcertained Truth only, that a ſinner at death is obliged to repent, but that he is then *only* obliged (which is to the purpoſe) ſhall never be proved.

I'll deal ingeniouſly, and help the Doctor: *Reginald* ſeems to ſay more then what this Empty Engliſh Quotation ſets down. His words are: *Omnium communis, ſententia eſt, tempus in quo peccator conteri tenetur, (intellige per ſe, ſeu vi ſpecialis Præcepti de contritione a deo dati) eſſe imminentem articulum mortis naturalis, vel violentæ.*

The

The common Opinion of all is, that the time wherein a ſinner is bound to repent, (underſtand Per ſe, or by force of a ſpecial command given by Almighty God of contrition) is the imminent Article of a natural or violent death. This Parentheſis (*intellige Per ſe*) which * ſeems excluſive of other ſpecial precepts ſave only at death, and would moſt have been for advantage, the Doctor wiſely leaves out. However with it he ſhall never make his aſſertion good, *viz.* that *Reginald holds, a ſinner is not obliged to repent but only in the hour of death*, and I ſpeak of an Obligation *per ſe*, not of accidental caſes, as if one makes a vow to have contrition, or to come to the Sacraments, &c. My reaſon is: that although there be no ſpecial command, *given by Almighty God* for contrition, but only in that Article; yet, the very Law of Nature, and the Charity, that a long inveterate ſinner, owes to his own Soul, both may, and doth oblige him ſometimes in life to convert himſelf to his Maker by hearty repentance; whereof more hereafter. *Reginaldus* further obſerves, out of St. *Auſtin, That he who lives thus impenitent, incurs not only the danger of tranſgreſſing anew, but deeply hazards his Salvation, which hazard*, intrincical to the ſtate of ſuch an inveterate Criminal; calls loud upon him; yes, and obliges him ſometimes in life to repentance, or the Love of God. Had the Doctor conſidered the counſel given us in Scripture, *Eccleſ.* 5. *Ne tardes converti ad Dominum, & ne differas de die in diem*: *Do not delay this converſion*, &c. And how Zealouſly both Divines in Schools, and Preachers in their Pulpits inculcate this wholeſome Doctrine, and lay open the danger of delaying ſinners, He would never have blamed *Reginald*, who only rigorouſly examins what men are obliged to, under mortal ſin; *Ex vi ſpecialis præcepti de contritione a deo dati*: where every particle is reſtrictive, and little warrants the Doctors charge

* *I ſay it ſeems for I cannot aſſert that Reginald plainly ſays ſo much.*

charge on him, in the general: *No repentance but in the Article of death only.* The Doctor cites other words of *Reginald* mangled, and weighed out of their circumſtances. Let that paſs among leſſer faults.

Now one word of his new Learning: He ſaith then pag. 76. *that a ſinner ought to repent preſently after his ſin.* I ask him whether he hath *any precept* for this aſſertion in Scripture, and mind him of his own Quotation: *'Tis the part of a Deviliſh ſpirit to think any thing to be Divine, that is not Scripture.* Here we may have plain dealing, if he pleaſe; Either he can give Scripture for a ſinners preſent repentence after ſin, or no; if he cannot, he hath a *deviliſh ſpirit*, impoſing on poor Souls a Divine command, not proved by Scripture; if he warrants this precept by Scripture, without gloſs, and interpretation of his own, I will proclaim to the whole World, that Dr. *Taylor* is one of the moſt profound Divines we have now in *Europe*: But this he ſhall never do: Therefore I am afraid the other Lot will fall on him.

I will be plain. Moſt harſh and an intolerable Doctrine it is to ſay, that a ſinner under new mortal ſin, is obliged to repent preſently, eſpecially in the Doctors Opinion, who makes no diſtinction between ſins mortal, and venial in their own Nature. Obſerve I beſeech you: Put caſe that one commits a Murther this day, and continues in the ſin for Months and Years, it followeth evidently, that for every Moment of theſe Months and Years, (if he reflects on his Homicide) he ſins a new unleſs he repents: Why? *The command of God is that he repent preſently after his Fact:* This command he Tranſgreſſes, and therefore ſins a new; the next Moment, Hour, or day, the ſame ſevere Command of God (obliging to repentance) leaves him not, he

ſins

ſins ſtill on, and conſequently, for as many Moments as he lives (let it be for Years) he heaps ſin upon ſin, and multiplies them without number: for the command of God obliging all this while to repentance, is grievouſly tranſgreſſed, and to tranſgreſs that Law, makes ſo often, with our Doctor, ſo many ſins. Is not here a *ſad* and deplorable *ſtory*, to uſe the Phraſe of our Doctor? Is it not much better to ſay with *Reginald* that it is a leſſer evil for a man to continue under one ſin for a time, (though ſuch a condition is deplorable) then to have ſins multiplyed hourly and daily, almoſt numberleſs? Now if the Negative precept, as *Reginald* holds, forbids not the perſeverance in ſin, (at leaſt for ſome time) theſe whole Troops of tranſgreſſions, which (according to the Doctor) intervene between the firſt ſin committed, and final repentance are avoided. Here is mercy to a poor ſinner. The Doctor mercileſly without Scripture, without Authority at all, ſaith what God never ſpake, and drives him to deſparation.

Page 77. he ſhews himſelf more then ſtrangely ignorant: And firſt, I do not touch upon what he ſaith, *That the Church hath been more ſevere then God, tying a ſinner by collateral poſitive Laws to repent at* Eaſter; *nor ſecondly, of the ſeeming contradiction, which follows, that the Church Ordains but the means, the exterior ſolemnity of it (that is confeſſion,* &c.) Theſe I wave, and wiſh the Reader to reflect on the laſt words in that Paragraph: *So that ſinners,* ſaith he, *are ſtill left to their liberties,* &c. *even to ſatisfie our ſelves with all the remaining pleaſures of that ſin for a little while, even during our ſhort mortal Life: only we muſt be ſure to repent at laſt.* Mark well, *Even to ſatisfie our ſelves, with all the remaining pleaſures of that ſin for our mortal life.* What! a Doctor of Divinity and ſpeak thus? why there is none but knows, that the taking of

content

content, or ſatisfaction in the pleaſure of a ſin paſt, is another hidious ſin, forbidden by Almighty God, and execrated by all Doctors. A ſin once committed remains habitually, (miſery enough) until it be retracted by penance; but to take pleaſure in it afterwards, is another guilt diſtinct from the former, unto which it ſeems our Doctors Divinity reaches not.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Doctors cavils againſt Contrition and Confeſſion. Of his wronging the Council of Trent *and Catholick Authors.*

THe Doctor in his 78. pag. has nothing but talk without ſubſtance: In his 79. he excepts againſt our Doctrine of contrition, and ſaith we allow it not valuable, unleſs it includes a deſire, or will to confeſs our ſins to a Prieſt. *Anſw.* We do ſo, and give this reaſon: True contrition, which reconciles to God, votively at leaſt implies a will of doing what God Commands: But one Command is, that we confeſs our ſins to a Prieſt; therefore true Contrition ſubmits to it. This proof is evident, if God have laid a precept on us to confeſs to a Prieſt, which by all Law of diſputation we may here ſuppoſe, until the Doctor ſhews the contrary.

Add to this what our Doctor hath, page 101. *viz.*

That confeſſion is of excellent uſe among the Pious Children of the Church of England. If ſo, give me leave to ask him, who Ordained this Confeſſion? God, or the Church? or whether there is Scripture for it, or no? if neither God, Scripture, nor Church warrant it, it is an invention of man, and may participate, (according to our Doctor) *of a deviliſh ſpirit*, conſequently cannot be of excellent uſe among any, *&c.* Now, if Scripture be for Confeſſion, if God, or the Church have Ordained it, the Doctor muſt ſay, (if he knows what true Contrition is) that the Supernatural Act which reconciles to God, doth of neceſſity imply (Actually or Votively) a ſerious will of doing what ever God, Scripture, or Church Commands us: for to ſay, I am ſorry for my ſin, out of the Motive of Gods infinite Love, I purpoſe amendment, I'll do his Will hereafter; *and not to ſay*, I'll do what God, Scripture, or Church commandeth, implies a contradiction; in a word, it is to ſay and unſay, purpoſe and not purpoſe, *&c.*

To confirme this diſcourſe, I have enough from the Doctor, pag. 79. who ſaith that *Genuine and true Contrition is a Cordial ſorrow for having ſinned againſt God, &c.* — *Ending in a dereliction of all ſin, and a walking in all Righteouſneſs.* I wiſh no more; for this *very walking in all Righteouſneſs*, implies the obedience we give to Contrition, and will make our good Doctor walk to Confeſſion alſo, if Scripture or Church have Ordained it for ſinners: perhaps he may ſay, that Confeſſion is only of Counſel, not of Command; when I have his Scripture for ſuch an aſſertion, he ſhall have his anſwer fully.

In the interim, know, that it is but vain to talk (as our Doctor doth) of a repentance *towards God*, (as it were *in abſtracto*) without deſcending to the ultimate worth

worth and Efficacy of it, which as now I ſaid includes a ſerious will of doing Gods Command. This truth ſuppoſed, with what conſcience can the Doctor ſay that we preſer repentance *towards* men, before that which the Scripture calls repentance *towards* God? It is a flat Calumny, and as ill intended, as expreſſed improperly; for in this Sacrament there is Confeſſion to a man, but what repentance is there *towards men* that we prefer before the Noble Act of Contrition, which reſting in God, prefers him and his Commands, before all things in the World?

A few lines after he ſaith, pag. 80. *As Contrition without their Ritual and Sacramental Confeſſion will not reconcile us to God; ſo Attrition with their Sacrament will reconcile the ſinner: Contrition without it will not: Attrition with it will reconcile us. And this Doctrine* (ſaith he) *is expreſly Decreed at* Trent.

I ſtand here aſtoniſhed at this ignorance: Do I read in a Doctor, that Contrition without *Ritual* and *Sacramental* Confeſſion doth not reconcile a ſinner, and that the Council of *Trent* Decrees this expreſly? I ſay firſt, that the Council expreſly declares the contrary. *Seſſ.* 14. *cap.* 4. *de contritione*: *Docet præterea* [Sancta Synodus] *& Si contritionem hanc aliquando charitate perfectam eſſe contingat, hominem Deo reconciliare, prius quam hoc Sacramentum actu ſuſcipiatur*, &c. The Holy Synod teaches, *Although it ſometimes falls out, that this Contrition when perfect with Charity, reconciles a man with God before actual taking of the Sacrament*, &c. The words are contrary to the Doctors aſſertion, and need no explication.

I ſay, 2. It is the certain and conſtant Doctrine of Divines, that Contrition (proceeding from the Love of God, or true motive of Charity) in the very Mo-

ment a Soul hath it, gain's pardon, reconciles to God, diſpoſes immediately to ſupernatural Grace, whereby a ſinner is juſtified, and made an adopted Child of God; and this I ſay, In the *very Moment a Soul hath it*, though Sacramental Confeſſion follows not, for weeks, or months, or by accident never; for would it not be a pittiful caſe to ſend a poor ſinner to Hell, who lies at deaths door, or is mortally wounded, & doth his utmoſt to be contrite for his ſins, though neither Prieſt is preſent, nor Sacramental Confeſſion can be had or hoped for? This very caſe is enough to unbeguile the Doctor, and to ſatisfie him that we Catholicks are not ſo ſevere in exacting Sacramental Confeſſion, when either accident or neceſſity excludes a poor penitent from it.

I know not how the Doctor will come off, and ſatisfie for the enormious injuſtice done, both to the Council of *Trent* and all Catholicks, but by one evaſion that ſhall nothing at all avail him.

Perhaps he may tell us, that when he ſays, *Contrition without Sacramental Confeſſion will not reconcile us*, he only ſpeaks of *Votive Confeſſion* included in the Act of Contrition, and not of Actual. No, I thought Ritual, as he terms it, and Sacramental Confeſſion had been in plain Engliſh Synonimas, or of the ſame ſignification with Actual Confeſſion. However, if the Doctor underſtands it of Votive Confeſſion, read his words thus: *Contrition without Confeſſion in Vote or deſire, reconciles not a ſinner to God*, and this you muſt ſuppoſe to be his meaning. Then know, we Catholicks hold conſtantly, that Contrition without the *Vote* or Efficatious will of Confeſſion is no Contrition, conſequently all he proves is, that that Act which is no Contrition *doth not reconcile to God*. How then doth he advance any new proof againſt us? Where lies the Miſchief or Malignity of our Doctrine

in

in ſaying, that an Act, which is no Contrition and ſubmits not in *Voto* to Gods Command, *doth not reconcile us to God*? yet more.

If he ſpeaks not of Actual, but Votive Confeſſion included in Contrition, his whole diſcourſe is lame, hobling, and renders you this Non-ſence: As Contrition without Sacramental Confeſſion (in Vote or deſire) *doth not reconcile us to God*, ſo attrition with actual, Sacramental Confeſſion doth reconcile us, which inference without life and vigor, ſhews nothing to the Doctors purpoſe; for what doth it avail him to ſay in this place, as no Contrition doth reconcile us, ſo Attrition with the Sacrament doth? Had he ſaid, as Contrition with Votive Confeſſion reconciles us to God, ſo Attrition alſo with Actual Confeſſion doth; the ſence had been good and Catholick: But never ſhall he make ſence out of theſe words: *As Contrition without Confeſſion will not reconcile us to God, ſo*, &c. unleſs he ſpeaks (as really he doth) of *Actual Confeſſion* as well requiſite for reconciliation when a ſinner is contrite, as when he is attrite only, which is injurious to Catholicks. If you ponder well what I have ſaid, you'll find the Doctor in a Labarinth, pull him out who will.

He goes on in his ignorance, and ſaith firſt, *that with us there is no neceſſity of Contrition at all. Anſw.* Moſt Untrue: It is neceſſary in a thouſand caſes of death and danger, when Attrition only will not avail without the Sacrament. He ſaith, 2. *A little repentance will prevail as well as the greateſt*; and cites *Gulielmus de Rubeo*; (he means *de Rubeone*.) I anſw. Two things may be conſidered in repentance: for Example in an Act of Contrition: The firſt is, the ſubſtance of that Act which implies a ſorrow for having ſinned againſt God, and offended his infinite goodneſs, with purpoſe of amend-

mendment, and this appretiative esteem of God is the same, and intrinsecal to every Act of Contrition, so much perfection it hath, or 'tis not Contrition. The second, is the gradual remisness or intensness of it, which may be various in a sinner; if remiss, it gains less Grace, if intens, more; and therefore upon this account benifits the sinner accordingly. But know, that the Doctor can never shew, either by Scripture or any received Authority, that Contrition, which is a remorse for sin upon the motive now specified ought to have such a gradual intention for the remission of it; and this is all that *Gulielmus de Rubione*, *Tolet*, and others say in our present controversie. If the Doctor will have more concerning this subject, he may read *Suarez tract. de charitate. Sect. 2. n. 2.* (and well Learn of him) that the gradual intention in acts of love towards God, is not necessary to comply with the precept of Loving him above all: *Suarez* his words are: *Illa perfectio dilectionis dei pertinet ad speciem, & naturam talis actus qui salvatur in quavis intensione. The perfection of Charity belongs to the species or nature of the Act, which is had whether the Act be more or less intens.* If *Suarez* his Authority like not the Doctor, I expect his Scripture to the contrary, and with all desire he would plainly say, how strong an intention in Contrition is necessary to reconcile a sinner, and this by Scripture, or some approved Authority.

Page 81. he shews himself little versed in our Divines, where he tells you, that we say, if a *man live a wicked life for 60 or 80 years, yet, if when he dyes (sooner then which God hath not commanded him to repent) he be a little sorrowful for his sins, and though this sorrow have no Love of God in it, if the Priest absolve, he is safe, the Priest with two Fingers and a Thumb doth the work for him,* &c.

First

First, I slight this jeer of two Fingers and a Thumb, God hath his Judgment for it, and may in time stupifie those two Fingers and Thumb that writ it, as once he did *Valens* his whole hand for an intended injury against a Priest. Next to clear this doubt, our Divines hold, that a man is commanded to convert himself sooner to God then in the Article of death; some whom *Suarez Supar* cites, *Sect.* 3. *nu.* 1. as *Capreol* and *Scot*, (too scrupulously) say, That as often as other precepts oblige us, (for example) to give an Alms, so often Charity must accompany the work done: others say not much less: *Suarez* teacheth and truely, *n.* 4. *That this precept of loving God some time in mans life obligeth per se by its self*, and adds, *that it is not to be deferr'd for a long time after the use of reason.* Finally concludes, *Qui per multos annos non exercet hunc actum amoris delinquit contra hoc præceptum. He that for many years exerciseth not this Act of Love, offends against the precept of Loving God.* Now if the precept obliges all, much more a sinner, who is an enemy to God. And here by the way, you may see the Doctors Argument above, pag. 76. further answered, and that *Regivoldus* and *Navar* there cited, have nothing contrary to this known and received Doctrine.

But what if one sins lustily on for 60. or 80. years, and omits these acts of loving God and his duty every way, can he, if he comes in the Article of death, with Attrition *only* to a Priest, pass into a state of Salvation, though then he neither loves God, nor has true Contrition? I answer, That many both Learned and Grave Divines say No; nor only, because the precept transgressed so long *then if ever* obligeth him, but upon this account chiefly, that such an obdurate sinner is bound in that dangerous hour to seek reconciliation with God, by the best and secureſt means; but an Act of Love and

per-

perfect Contrition are the ſecureſt; therefore to the one or other he is obliged. See *Suarez* now cited, *num.* 3. *Con. diſp.* 24. *de charitate. dub.* 5. *concluſ.* 3. and others: Withal be pleaſed to reflect, that the Doctor ſpake without book, when he ſo roundly told us, (as if none gainſaid it) that a *little ſorrow and the fear of Hell only* (which is falſe) *though it has no Love of God with it, paſſeth a ſinner in the Article of death to a ſtate of Salvation.* All this is ſaid at random: But what will ye? his head was ſo taken up with his pretty conceit of the Prieſts two Fingers and a Thumb, that he forgot his Divinity.

In his 2 *Sect.* pag. 82. He comes full charged againſt the uſe of Confeſſion among Catholicks, *Though with the pious Children of the Church in* England, *it is of excellent uſe.* Anſw. Beſides calumnies, and ſlanders in this Section he hath nothing worth notice. *Princes*, ſays he, *and Prelates do often confeſs, and are never the better.* How proves he this ſlander? or let him ſay, what is done better *with his excellent uſe of Confeſſion among the Pious Prelates in the Church of England.* 2. He ſaith, That *men look on this Cure like pulling off their Clothes.* Anſw. A ſlander: But tell me, is it better in the Church of *England* among *thoſe Pious Children* he mentioneth? 3. *That they confeſs to day* (pag. 83.) and *ſin to morrow.* Anſw. And do none ſin to morrow, who confeſs to day in the Church of *England*? Confeſſion makes not men impeccable, yet is an excellent remedy to prevent ſin, and ſo our Doctor will ſuppoſe it is among *the Pious Children of the Church of England.* 4. He ſaith, *Confeſſion is made a Miniſter of State, a Pick-lock of Secrets, a Spie upon Families*, &c. *Anſw.* A Calumny: The whole Chriſtian World knows the contrary, and I tell you the Doctor is more obliged to make reſtitution for

the

the wrong done to Catholick Prieſts in this particular then any Theif is, who picks his pocket: But tell me, is Confeſſion a pick-lock with Catholicks only (in caſe all were true that he ſaith without conſcience) is there no *Pick-lock of ſecrets, or ſpie upon Families among thoſe Pious Miniſters in the Church of* England? I have heard the contrary, that whole Confeſſions have been revealed by them; whether true or no, I ſay not; yet I know well, that for the ſpace of forty years that I have lived in Catholick Countries, I never heard the leaſt complaint againſt Confeſſor for being a *Pick-lock*. The Doctor therefore may well expect Gods juſt Judgment on him for this injuſtice, unpardonably done, (unleſs he repents and makes reſtitution) to Catholick Prieſts. But enough of this Section.

Pag. 86. *Sect.* 3. he hath a bout with our *Penance* and *ſatisfaction*, and makes a long liſt of their abuſes. *They are* (ſaith he) *reduced from the ancient Canonical Penances to private and arbitrary; from years to hours; from great ſeverity to gentleneſs and flattery; from publick ſhame, to the ſaying over their beads; from Cordial to Ritual, from ſmart to money, from heartineſs and earneſt, to pageantry and theatrical Images of Penance.* Anſw. Though 'tis true that the Church hath upon weighty reaſons much leſſened the rigor of ancient Penances, and therefore ſo frequently grant's Indulgences, yet what follows in this pretended Catalogue of abuſes, is nothing but a long Liſt of Calumnies, falſe and injurious. Falſe it is, that if the ſin confeſſed deſerves a years Pennance, we reduce it to an hours: Falſe, that we turn the ſeverity of Penance into flattery, (unleſs the Doctor calls the charitable comforting a poor penitent flattery.) No, ſo far are we from flattery in this Tribunal of Penance, that we lay open the enormity of ſin, threatning Gods Judgement upon

it, and ſpare no pains to beget a horror of ſinning in a penitents heart. Falſe it is, that if the ſin be enormious or ſcandalous, the ſaying ones beads is enough. Falſe it is, that we exact only Ritual and not Cordial ſatisfaction. Falſe likewiſe, that when the penitent ought to ſmart for his ſin, the ſmart is turned into money; though I think the Doctor will not deny, but that in circumſtances of age or infirmity, when the penitent cannot bear auſterity, the charitable giving of Alms is laudable and ſatisfactory; at leaſt holy *Daniel* liked well of it: *Cap.*4. 24. *Peccata tua elemoſynis redime, & iniquitates tuas miſericordiis pauperum. Redeem, make amends for thy ſins with Alms-deeds, and thy iniquities with mercies of the Poor.* Falſe, finally it is, that we require not heartineſs and *earneſt* in the performance of Penance. Now what the Doctor means by his *Pageantry and Theatrical Images of Penance*, God I think only knows: Perhaps he blames ſome publick Penances now and then done in the Church; If ſo; firſt, all publick Penances are not laid aſide. 2. You ſee the Peeviſhneſs of our Doctor, nothing eſcapes his cenſure; if Penances be private, the Ancient Canons ſuffer; if publick, they are *pageantry and theatrical Images*: What will content the man? When one ſtands there among you at a Pillar for Perjury, or in a white Sheet for Fornication; is this *pageantry*, or any *theatrical Images*? and what further uſe have you I beſeech ye, of theſe ancient Canonical Penances among the Pious Penitents of the Church of *England*?

Well, to conclude; the Doctor I am ſure deſerves juſtly a ſevere Penance for this heap of Calumnies, and if ever God (as I wiſh) make him a Catholick, and chooſe me for Confeſſor, he ſhall have it home without flattery; an hours Penance, or ſaying his Beads

Beads will be too little; in a word, his Penance ſhall be proportionate to his ſin, and if he thinks it not enough, let him go on Gods name to *Sancta Maria de populo*, for the gaining of thoſe thouſand Indulgences he mentioneth. He holds on this 3*d*. Section, and tells you of ſtrange Indulgences granted to ſeveral places, whether truly or no, it imports little: Admit he ſpeaks truth, all he gets is that the Church is liberally good to ſuch great ſinners as he is, who as Holy *Iob* ſaith, *Drink iniquity like water*; and if after their repentance, it grants them Mercy, what offence is there in doing ſo? In the reſt of that weightleſs Section, while he explicates what Divines ſay of Indulgences; ſometimes he hits right, ſometimes miſſes, but is ordinarily very plentiful in jeers, all flight ſtuff: I leave him; only be pleaſed to reflect, how, though without pointing to any place, he cites *Gerſon* and *Soto* againſt himſelf, for if it be true, that *Soto* ſaith in 4 *Sent. diſtinct.* 21 *q.*2. *a.*1. *That the Pope never grants theſe Indulgences for a* 100. *or* 1000. *years*, The Doctor hath no more to ſay, but that ſuch pardons are not at all (the Queſtuaries *only* procured them) and conſequently impugns what never was.

CHAP. XIII.

The ſum of our Doctors diſcourſe concerning Indulgences. His two miſtakes are diſcovered. His Objections anſwered.

THe Doctor pag. 91. *Sect.* 4. pretends much charity to our Souls, and to unbeguile us, will needs add one *conſideration more*: And what is this think you? Marry, *There is no Foundation of truth in theſe new Divices; and this to boot, that when our Doctors are pinched with an objection, they let their hold go*, &c. Good man! Are theſe his conſiderations? A young Student in Divinity, would make good ſport with ſuch conſiderations. But, *ad rem.*

I conſtantly affirm, that all he has ſaid in this Section, hath not ſo much as a ſhadow of an objection in it againſt the received Doctrine of Indulgences, much leſs any that *pinches*. To prove my aſſertion, be pleaſed to have in mind what this received Doctrine is, which the *Council of* Trent *ſeſſ.* 25. *decret. de Indulg.* declares thus: *Sacroſancta Synodus Indulgentiarum uſum, Chriſtiano populo maximè ſalutarem, & ſacrorum conciliorum authoritate probatum in Eccleſia retinendum eſſe docet, & præcipit. The holy Synod teaches, that the uſe of Indulgences is moſt wholeſome and profitable to Chriſtians; and commands this uſe approved by the Authority of holy Councils, to be held ſtill in the Church.* Next, it requires a moderation in granting Indulgences, ac-

according to the Ancient Cuſtome of the Church, and that all abuſes crept in, be amended, &c.

This Catholick truth ſuppoſed: you'll find the Doctor ſtrangely beguiled, and his whole diſcourſe (chiefly founded on two miſtakes) weaker then a Bul-ruſh. His firſt miſtake is, that becauſe Catholicks cannot arrive to a certain knowledge of gaining an Indulgence, or the full fruit of it, he thinks no truſt is to be had in it, no endeavour uſed to purchaſe this Grace. An error: For Divines ſay, and truly, no one can know with certainty, that he hath an act of true ſupernatural Faith, or of true Charity in that Degree, Purity and Meaſure which God exacts; is therefore Faith and Charity (*without truſt*) to be laid aſide? is our endeavour to have them careleſly to be left off? is it wholly uſeleſs and unprofitable? God forbid.

His ſecond error is, that he builds too much upon thoſe many difficulties which our Divines raiſe in this matter of Indulgences, while they ſpeculatively diſcuſs ſeveral caſes relating to them; and becauſe this is done with variety of Opinions, the Doctor thinks all undone, and that both the ſuſtance and fruit of Indulgences fail's in the Catholick Church.

A great miſtake: For are there not innumerable difficulties ſpeculatively examined almoſt in every Article of Chriſtian belief, concerning Baptiſm and other Sacraments? yes, concerning the profeſſion of our Faith in certain exigences: yet theſe ſpeculative conſiderations terrifie none from profeſſing the neceſſity and benefit both of faith and Sacraments. The like with a due proportion we ſay of Indulgences (not ſo neceſſary to Salvation, as Faith or Baptiſm;) though difficulties in *ſuch* and *ſuch* particular caſes are moved concerning them, yet all

agree

agree in the general with the Council of *Trent*, that they are uſeful, profitable and beneficial to Chriſtian penitents.

Having thus diſcovered the two tranſcendent miſtakes of our Doctor, you ſhall ſee how unskilfully he combates againſt Indulgences.

Page 92. he ſaith, *Suppoſe the Indulgence be for forty years, a hundred, a thouſand; yet peradventure according to the old penitential rate, you have deſerved the Penance of forty thouſand years*, &c. *Anſw.* A long time indeed! but peradventure this *peradventure* of the Doctors is a miſtake; at leaſt ſomething is gained beſides the merit of the work, though we know not how much; and better it is to have forty years of Penance taken off, then to ſuffer torment for forty years, though not yet quitted of all pain. (If the damned in Hell could but have forty years of their pain releaſed, thsy would deem it a favour) Therefore the Doctrine of the *Council of Trent is* true: *Uſus indulgentiarum eſt ſalutaris.*

Again he ſaith, *No man can tell the difference, when what remains ſhall be ſo great as to ſurmount all the evils of this life.* Anſw. Neither is it neceſſary: The duty of a good Chriſtian is to take off what pain he can, though he knows not in what meaſure; and if he diminiſhes but ſome little, the uſe of Indulgences is both good and profitable. I leave that jeer of the *Dæmoniach* with the Doctor; and tell him that if one poor ſoul were poſſeſſed with a legion of Deviles, and had moral aſſurance that he is freed of ſome (though he knows not of how many) that little releaſement would be of comfort.

Page 93. He goes on doubting. *It may be your Quadragenes, are not carenes*, &c. *It may be you have purchaſed but ſome lighter thing; and then, if your demerit a-*

riſe

riſe to ſo many Carenes, and you have purchaſed but meer Quadragenes, you may ſtay longer in Purgatory then you expected. Anſw. It may be the Doctor is deceived in all he ſaith here: It may be a penitent gets all he expected. But admit he doth not, ſomething is got, (he hath at leaſt the merit of his work) though he knows not how much. The not knowing of his gain doth not leſſen it. Though the Doctor knows not preciſely how pure his Act of Charity is, the value of it is ſo much in the ſight of God, neither more nor leſs, upon the account of his own not knowing it.

He ſaith again: *It is not agreed among Doctors, whether a plenary Indulgence is to be extended beyond the taking off thoſe Penances, which were enjoyned by the Confeſſor.* Anſw. Though it be moſt true that a plenary Indulgence proceeding from lawful Authority, granted upon a Juſt and Pious Cauſe, extends it ſelf to the taking away of all pain, if the penitent complys with his duty; yet here we will not enter on this Queſtion, nor ſay, how ſincerely *Turrecremata* with the others are cited. Content we are with that which the Doctor does not deny, viz. *That Indulgences take off thoſe Penances enjoyned by the Confeſſor*: And with this ſmall Pittance of Pardon we conclude that the *Council of Trent* ſaith true: *Uſus Indulgentiarum eſt ſalutaris. The uſe of Indulgences is wholeſome.*

He further tells us, page 94. *That if a perſon be not capable of an Indulgence, becauſe he is not in the ſtate of Grace, he gains nothing.* Anſw. No one doubts of this. The only wonder is that our Doctor ſpends his Ink and Paper to no better purpoſe. Soon after he ſaith, that *Pope* Adrian *troubles the whole affair again*, and for it he cites *Patrus Suavis Polanus in his Hiſtory of the Council of Trent* to prove juſt nothing: *Polanus* his words are (though

his

his Authority is little with me) *Pontifex, qui ut Theologus*, &c. *The Pope, who as a Divine had writ of Indulgences* (*before* Luther *ever handled the matter*) *thought to eſtabliſh by an Apoſtolical Decree, what he had formerly taught as a private Doctor.* And what is this Doctrine of *Adrian* a private Doctor? *Quando Indulgentia conceditur alicui*, &c. *when an Indulgence is granted to any body, it may be he doth not the work required to be done ſo perfectly, as to gain the whole Indulgence: Now if any thing be wanting to the perfection of the work, he gains not the whole Indulgence, but a part of it, correſponding to the work, leſs well performed.* What is here for the Doctors advantage? What is here againſt the *Council of Trent*? *Uſus Indulgentiarum eſt ſalutaris.* Something is got by Indulgences according to *Adrian*, who only ſpake as a private Doctor Were any thing amiſs, as in reaſon there is not. But here I muſt tyre you with a piece of the Doctors ſubtilty, who ſaith, *That if the Indulgence be only given according to the worthineſs of the work done, then that* (*viz.* the work) *will avail of it ſelf, without any grant from the Church.* A ſtrong Objection! I anſwer, The work will avail of it ſelf to merit, and if penal, to ſome ſatisfaction, but not to the releaſing of ſo much temporal pain as the Indulgence takes off, in caſe it be worthily comply'd with.

The Doctors *greater heap of dangers*, which he ſets down from his *6. number* of *pag.* 94. to 98. hath ſo little danger of an Objection, that to read them is to anſwer them. For what ſence is there to tell us, *That we muſt be ſure of the Authority of him that gives the Indulgence*? We have all Moral aſſurance for it, and incomparably greater then any one hath in *England*, that his Miniſter Preaches with Authority to Preach, or delivers true Doctrine. What ſence is there to ask. *If one has an In-*

dulgence

dulgence for the Article of death, and dies not then; whether a new one is to be got for the next ſickneſs? As doughty an objection it is, that he hath concerning the *Gregorian Calendar*: as likewiſe, his doubt whether a Pope can recal an Indulgence granted by his Predeceſſor. This and a great deal more which the Doctor has concerning this matter is (he himſelf knows it) moſt empty ſtuff.

But you'll ask what I ſay to the great objection he toucheth on here: pag. 96. and propoſeth more largely in the beginning of this Section, concerning the emptying of Purgatory? *Certainly the Millions of Indulgences, and innumerable other helps in the Church ſhould ere this have a hundred times over evacuated that place of its ſad Inhabitants.* I anſwer, this Objection is like the reſt, feeble and forceleſs; and would the Doctor ponder well theſe words of the *Royal Prophet Pſal.* 100. *Miſericordiam & judicium cantabo tibi, Domine,* He would ſee the weakneſs of it: *God is Merciful, but withal juſt.* His Mercy impowers the Church to free many: But that prodigal uſe of the Keys in freeing all, would be againſt Juſtice, and would make ſinners little to value or fear thoſe torments, which St. *Auſtin* ſays, *Surpaſs all the pains in this world.*

CHAP. XIV.

A word more of Indulgences. Of the Doctors Miſtakes in quoting Authors. Whether the Prayer of a ſinner avails him. Of the Doctors harſh Doctrine.

THe Doctor after his High *heap of dangers* and great number of little doubts, pag. 97. tells us, that there is one thing neceſſary, *viz. To work out our Salvation with fear and trembling.* Anſw. Firſt, a poor penitent that apprehends moſt deeply the pain of Purgatory, and doth ſo much Penance as we ſee daily done among good Chriſtians for the releaſment of that pain, cannot be ſuppoſed in any Chriſtians Charity to be without *fear and trembling.* 2. We might (if it were worth the while) move as many doubts concerning this *fear and trembling*, as he doth againſt Indulgences. We might ask him to work out our Salvation: how often muſt we *fear*? How often muſt we *tremble*? From what motive muſt this *fear* proceed? How ſtrong and intens muſt this *trembling* be? when all is done: How know we that we have *trembled* enough? and whether we are not to *tremble*, till we all turn Quakers? Let the Doctor reſolve theſe doubts upon good certainty; and I'll warrant you, his ſcruples about Indulgences will ceaſe. What he adds *of Venial ſins hindring the fruit of Indulgences*, is not worth taking notice of. But,

Saith

Saith he, pag. 99. *Pope* Adrian *taught a worſe matter, viz. He that will obtain an Indulgence for another*, &c. And where find we this *worſe matter*? Mark, I beſeech you, his Marginal Quotation, *Apud Petrum de Soto. lect. de inſtitut. Sacerd. de neceſſariis ad effectum Indulg.* Truly our Doctor all along hath been unfortunate in his citations, and here he ſhews himſelf ſo very unskilful, that I believe he never ſaw *Soto*. Know then that *Petrus de Soto*; beſides other works, hath a book in a large *Decimo ſexto*, which he Intitles: *Tractatus de inſtitutione ſacerdotum*, (with me it is printed at *Brixia*, *anno* 1586.) under that Title in general he handles many Queſtions, *De ſcientia ſacerdotum*, *de Baptiſmo*, and *other Sacraments*; &c. Every Treatiſe he devides into *Lectiones*: And after the middle of the Book hath a Title, *de Indulgentiis*, pag. 263. This Treatiſe he divides into three *Lectiones*. Now the Doctor gives you not the Right *Lectio* of that Treatiſe (which is the third in number) but unskilfully directs you to his *Lectio de Inſtitutione ſacerdotum*: There is no general *Lectio*, but *Tractatus de inſtitutione ſacerdotum*, the *Lections* are *ſubdiviſions* to ſeveral Treatiſes.

Well, though without much help from the Doctor we have found the place in *Soto*: *Lectio* 3. now cited page (with me) 275. his words are: *Notat Hadrianus circa hoc, & movet quæſtionem*, &c. *Adrian* (*who by the way* ſpeaks not as *Pope*, but as a Divine or private Doctor) *propoſeth this Queſtion, whether one in mortal ſin can avail to obtain an Indulgence for another, as if an Indulgence* (for Example) *be granted to him who gives an Alms, or to him for whom it is given by another*. *Adrian* holds the Affirmative, *So that he who doth the work, and wiſheth the Indulgence to another, doth an action Morally good*: *Nam pro peccato non conceditur Indulgentia*: *For an Indulgence*

is never granted for a ſinful work. This I ſay, was *Adrians* private Opinion not ſo harſhly related by *Soto*, as it is by our Doctor, who talks as if it were a definition of a *Pope*. *Pope* Adrian *taught a worſe matter.*

I cenſure not *Adrians* Opinion (he was a great Divine) nor approve it; yet this I'll ſay, that the Doctor doth not ſo much as probably impugn it. Mark how weakly he argues: *As if*, ſaith he, *a man could do more for another, then he can do for himſelf.* Anſw. Moſt certainly he may: Cannot one uncapable of a dignity, or a favour in a Common-wealth, beg of his Prince a Grace for another who is capable? A meer ſecular man, unlearned and Married, may petition his Majeſty (and perhaps prevail) that Doctor *Taylor* be the next Biſhop of *Canterbury* (who they ſay lives ever unmarried.) Here is our very Caſe: This ſecular man is uncapable of ſuch a Grace: So a ſinner is of an Indulgence. This ſecular man prevails to get the Grace for another who is capable: ſo a ſinner may prevail to obtain an Indulgence for another juſt man capable of the favour. (The parity holds exactly) Therefore it is evident, that one may do more for another then he can for himſelf in ſome caſes. The Doctor goes on, and ſpeaks not like a Chriſtian: *As if* (ſaith he) *God would regard the Prayers of a wicked perſon when he intercedes for another, and at the ſame time, if he Prays for himſelf, his Prayer is an abomination.* Anſw. This laſt is certainly impious Doctrine, for the conſequence of it muſt needs be this; *That no ſinner ought in conſcience ever to Pray for himſelf.* I'll prove what I ſay thus: No ſinner can in conſcience commit an abomination in the ſight of God, or ſin mortally: But to pray for himſelf is an abomination, and a mortal ſin; therefore no ſinner can in conſcience pray for himſelf.

Con-

Conſequently that poor Publican, (*9 Ioan*) that prayed for himſelf *Deus propitius mihi eſto peccatori. God be merciful, to me a ſinner*: Was an abominable man upon the account of his Prayer: which place of Scripture, no leſs a Doctor then St. *Auſtin* made uſe of, to prove that a ſinner may pray for himſelf.

Were the Doctor a Divine, I could tell him that prayer in a wicked man may be a ſupernatural Act, and proceed from Gods Grace (not ſanctifying Grace) as Faith is ſupernatural, which preceeds juſtification in a ſinner. What he adds of *a work done ungratiouſly*, is a wrong to *Adrian*; who requires *Opus Moraliter bonum*: *A work morally good*, though *not meritorious*.

Finally, the Doctor ſaith, that becauſe Divines require the ſtate of Grace neceſſary in a man at that time he gains an Indulgence, (though before a ſinner) *they turn Divinity into Mathematicks and Clock-work*. A conceit not worthy a Doctor; ſay, I beſeech you, if this good man aſcends a Pulpit, and alarems his hearers thus. Good people, you have hitherto profited little by my Sermons: *Hodie ſi vocem ejus audieritis: To day, this very moment, this minute, if you'll hear God ſpeak by me, you are happy*, &c. Doth he turn his Sermon into a *Clock-work*? Or, did the Apoſtle *Clock* it when he told the *Corinthians Ecce nunc tempus acceptabile. Now is the time acceptable. Ecce nunc dies ſalutis. Now is the day of Salvation.* 2 *Cor.* 6. Again. *Hora eſt jam nos de ſomno ſurgere, nunc enim proprior eſt noſtra ſalus. 'Tis the hour now*, &c. Here is more of the *Clock*, of *Minutes*, and *hours*, then any Divine mentioneth in our preſent matter.

Yet more. Pray ſee how artificially he windes about to bring in his *Clock-work*. Though ſaith he, it be *not neceſſary, that when the Indulgence is granted, the man*

be

be in the ſtate of Grace; yet it is neceſſary that at ſome time or other, within the term preſcribed of the Indulgence, if he will gain it. And to make his conceit of his *Clock* to run on: he adds: *At any time* (*it ſeems*) *it will ſerve*, which ſounds falſly, and is ſo; but here is enough of this *Clock*.

Next he blames ſome Divines who ſay, *That if a man ſin in hope of Iubilee, or Indulgence to be granted afterward, he may yet gain the pardon.* Anſw. He may ſo, unleſs the Indulgence poſitively excludes ſuch a man from the favour: Why? the guilt of that ſin is remiſſible by Contrition and Penance; and ſo likewiſe is the temporal pain due to it pardonable, by vertue of an Indulgence.

Page 100. He is upon his old miſtakes again concerning Contrition, and thinks it may be ſufficient without either act or deſire of Confeſſion. This is anſwered above.

Page 101. After the praiſe he gives to that excellent uſe of Confeſſion among *the Pious Children of the Church of England*: He finds fault with our ſatisfaction and Penance, much taken away by the new Doctrine of Indulgences. *Anſw.* Moſt evident it is, notwithſtanding ſo many Indulgences granted, that the Ancient uſe of Penance is in a manner only found among Catholicks: Theſe are they who faſt, theſe Pray, theſe curb their paſſions, theſe often practiſe great Auſterity; yes, and live ſometimes in a mean condition, to relieve the Poor. A Volume would not ſuffice to expreſs the fruit of their hearty Repentance and eminent Charity, manifeſt to our eyes in every Town and City. Now for Gods-ſake, what have we like this among Proteſtants? The hearing of a Sermon on Sunday is the moſt they do; and yet there is no *Declenſion* of primitive Diſcipline among

mong them. Would to God our Doctor were ſhut up in a *Carthuſians* Cell, and lived as they live but for one year only: he would both practice and ſee more Penance done, then he hath either practiſed, or ſeen in *England* for his whole life; and yet forſooth, we muſt hear his Lord-ſhip talk *of a Declenſion in Primitive Diſcipline*, and think *all fine*, when he *words it, with living Godly in Chriſt Ieſus.*

I never ſaw that book of *Taxa Cameræ*, which the Doctor mentions, pag. 102. and therefore cannot ſay what is in it, likely it is a Libel; ſure I am that *Claudius Eſpencæus* wiſhes it ſuppreſſed, and if as he ſaith, *Plurimis quidem licentia, omnibus autem abſolutio empturientibus propoſita. That licence is given to many, and abſolution propoſed to all that buy it.* I cannot but judge ill of the book; and as ill of the Doctor who Engliſhes *Eſpencæus*, thus--- *And yet to them who will pay for it, there is to many given a Licence, and to all an abſolution for the greateſt and moſt horrid ſins.* Pray you what may theſe words, * *yet to them who will pay for it* ſignifie? do they relate to the Book, or to the Licenſe and abſolution for ſin? if the ſecond, the whole ſence is: *They who will lay down money, have Licenſe, (many at leaſt) to ſin, and all have abſolution from the moſt horrid ſins.* If the Doctor works this ſence out of *Eſpencæus* his words, he is more then uncharitable, to think that ever Pope or Prelate favoured that book; it is an infamous Libel that pretends Licenſe given to ſin. The beſt ſolution therefore is, that *Eſpencæus* is blamable as appears by the *Index Expurgatorius* of Cardinal *Zapata* printed, *Hiſpali.* 1631. where this very ſecond digreſſion of *Eſpencæus* is prohibited. *Vide verbum Claudius Eſpencæus*, page *Indicis* 219.

* Mark how the Doctor equivocates in thoſe words. *To them that will pay for it.*

The Doctor ſoon after cites you *Auguſtinus Triumphus de*

de Ancona teaching, *That the Pope ought not to grant Indulgences to them who have a deſire of giving money, but cannot; as to them who actually give*: and he adds immediately: *That in ſuch a caſe, it is not inconvenient that the Rich ſhould be in a better condition then the Poor.* In my whole life did I never meet with ſuch a Doctor, who neither cites right nor ſaies right. Mark I beſeech you, how he cites *Auguſtinus de Ancona* in his Margent: *De poteſtate Papæ quæſt.* 3. *ad* 3. The Quotation is ridiculous, and no more directs you to find any thing concerning Indulgences then if he ſent you to the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis*. Know therefore briefly, that *Auguſt. de Ancona* writ a ſum of Divinity *De poteſtate Eccleſiaſtica* printed *anno* 1320. under which general Title he handles many Difficulties, and proceeds Methodically; firſt by Queſtions, next by Articles; then gives his reſolution; and finally ſolves the objections. At the beginning of his Book, his firſt queſtion is, *De poteſtate Papæ*, and hath nine Articles under it: in the third Article not a word of our preſent matter, nor in any ſolution *ad* 3. In his *third Queſtion* he treats *De eligentium juriſdictione*, and hath ten Articles under it, and ſo many Reſolutions and Anſwers, not a word of Indulgences. In the mean while you ſee that our Doctors direction; *De poteſtate Papæ quæſt.* 3. *ad* 3. Helps you nothing. He ſhould (had he lighted on the right queſtion) have pointed out the Article, and then his *ad* 3. might have guided the Reader.

Well, I find in the 31. queſtion of *Auguſtinus* (far off from any 3. queſtion *De poteſtate Papæ*) *Articulo* 4. where he treats of Indulgences) theſe words, *ad* 3. *Si dives ita parum dat ut pauper, puto, quod non tantum habeat de Indulgentia dives ſicut pauper, quia tunc oportet recurrere ad juſtam æſtimationem facientis Indulgentiam, quæ pen-*

penſanda eſt valere ſecundum facultatem dantis. Sed ſi ſic dicatur: quicunque dabit unum denarium & dives illud daret, ſicut pauper; puto, quod tantum haberet dives ſicut pauper: quamvis tamen in hoc eſſent pares, in multis aliis melioris conditionis eſſet pauper, quam dives. The ſence is: *If the Rich man gives as little as the Poor man, I think the Rich man will not gain ſo much of the Pardon as the other. Recourſe here muſt be had to his will that grants the Pardon. But if it be ſaid: whoever gives a penny* (or ſuch a ſmall pittance) *and the Rich man gives ſo much and the Poor man alſo. Theſe two will be equal, and the one have as much as the other; yet upon other accounts the Poor mans condition will be better.* Here is all I can find in this Author, and it is moſt blameleſs Doctrine, nothing to the Doctors ſence, *viz. That Indulgences are not to be given to them who have a deſire of giving money, but cannot. And that in ſuch a caſe, it is not inconvenient that the Rich ſhould be in a bettter condition then the Poor.* If the Doctor will give me better direction to find what he quotes out of this or any other Author, he ſhall have his anſwer. But I perceive his way is not to examine the Originals, and therefore abuſeth a ſimple Reader; who when he ſees ſuch a cluſter of Marginal Quotations glitter like the Sun, thinks our Doctor more Learned then *Rabbi Kimki.*

CHAP. XV.

Of the Doctors weak Argument againſt one ſatisfying for another. Of his new Divinity, that the habit of ſin, is ſin. Of his worſe Doctrine that all ſins are mortal. Of his miſtaks, and charging on Catholicks what they hold not.

THe Doctor, pag. 103. and 6 Section (I think his 5th. Section hath ſuffered ſhip-wrack in the fourth, no great loſs of it) aſſaults us many ways. Firſt, he likes not our Doctrine, *That one man may ſatisfie for another*; and cites *Suarez* for it by halfs: *Part.* 4. (we ſay) *Tomo* 4. *in* 3. *partem diſp.* 38. *Sect.* 9. *I ſay by halfs*, for *Suarez* holds expreſly one cannot ſatisfie for another, unleſs the Confeſſor Licenſes that way of ſatisfying: for Example; if the Confeſſor injoyns his penitent to faſt: *Certum eſt* (ſaith *Suarez*) *It is certain, that another mans faſting will not be ſatisfactory.* He ſaith: 2. That a Confeſſor is not to do this without a juſt and neceſſary cauſe (perhaps of weakneſs and infirmity) becauſe it is not uſual in the Church. Theſe limitations our Doctor leaves out, and runs on with a jeſt. *The Rich man is whip'd upon another mans back, and his purſe only is the Penitent.* I anſwer, If the Rich mans back deſerves ſtripes (as well as ſome body does) no Confeſ-

ſor

ſor cauſeleſly laies them on another, nor makes *his purſe the penitent*; No, it is a ſlander to ſay that injoyned ſatisfaction is thus bought off with money.

Next comes the Doctors weighty Argument: *For by this Doctrine* (ſaith he) *viz. that one man may ſatisfie for another: it is not to be ſaid of Chriſt alone, that he was wounded for our tranſgreſſions, that he only ſatisfied for our ſins.* I anſwer, If this Argument have force, it proves as much againſt a mans own ſatisfaction, as againſt ſatisfaction done by another; for if Chriſt ſatisfied for all, (in the Doctors ſence) the Penitents own ſatisfaction (who is one amongſt all) is vain and fruitleſs, which is not here in queſtion. Again, our good Doctor gainſaies all the ſeverity of thoſe ancient Canonical Penances practiſed in the Church, and praiſed by him; for if Chriſt only hath ſatisfied for all; what need was there of ſuch rigid Penances among the primitive Chriſtians? it was done to their hands by Chriſt, their Penances therefore were ſuperfluous.

2. He blames us for ſaying, *The habit of ſin is no ſin diſtinct from the former Actions by which the habit was contracted.* So the Doctor, page 104. *Anſw.* Here is the moſt ſtrange Doctrine I ever read. Know therefore, that Divines diſtinguiſh between actual ſin; habitual ſin, which is ſin paſt, not yet pardoned; and the habit of ſining generated by frequent acts of vice, which makes a man unhappy, prone, ready, and facile to ſin again, juſt as the often repeating of a Verſe gives facility to ſay it anew with eaſe.

Now to affirm that this habit contracted by former multiplyed acts of ſin, is a ſin; ſeems a piece of new coyned Divinity: and proves that no ſinner habituated in

Vice if he dies immediately after his first act of Contrition, or ardent Love of God (which justifies him) can be saved. Why? This fervent act of Contrition Roots not quite out the *contracted habit of sin*; no saith our Doctor, (and truely) *There is required a longer time, and a procedure in the Method of a holy life to do this*: But this contracted habit of sin, is a sin, which the most fervent act of Contrition takes not away in a Moment; therefore if a sinner dies suddenly after his first Contrition, he cannot be saved; consequently, had St. *Mary Magdalen* departed this life, the next instant after her ardent Charity, she had been a lost Soul; and so the Doctor must say the good Theif on the Cross is who had little time granted to Root out his bad habits.

What the Doctor adds, that in our Doctrine *a man is not bound to interrupt the procedure of his impiety*, is most unjust dealing; for such an one is bound by the Law of God, and reason, not to sin, yes and by Repentance too, in case Repentance be the only means to help him.

The Doctor speaks not well while he insinuates that we are obliged to repent of our habits, if Repentance be taken properly: Repent we must of our sins, and Root out ill habits by contrary acts of Vertue; this is our duty. Finally, he is strangely out in saying, *As for those (sins) that come after, they are excused, if they be produced by a strong habit.* Answ. A strong habit of erring brought forth this assertion; it is highly injurious to Catholicks, and as far from truth, as the Doctor is from honest dealing with us.

Page 106. he teacheth that every venial sin *in its own Nature, and the rigor of Divine Justice is damnable*;

and

and that in the unregenerate theſe venial ſins are ſo accounted. Anſw. Moſt mercileſs and execrable Doctrine againſt the very light of Nature: For who can ſay, (if a ſpark of Reaſon lives in him) that in caſe one by ſpecial favour paſs his whole life without all other ſin then once ſpeaking an idle word, and dies immediately, who I ſay dare affirm that this man in rigor of Gods Divine Juſtice is a damned Soul, and muſt for that one little tranſgreſſion ſuffer the torments of Hell for eternity? Where is your Scripture, good Doctor, for this deſperate Doctrine? produce it, let us read the place with you; but never ſhall you do it, till you prove it by Scripture, that a Gnat is as big as a Camel, and a Mote in the Sun as great as a Houſe-beam: He may ſay the caſe now ſet down is ſomewhat extraordinary; be it ſo, it implies no impoſſibility, and therefore laies open even to *Turks* and *Heathens* the prodigious impiety of this Doctrine.

The Doctor goes on, and tells us; *That though venial ſins of their own Nature are damnable, yet by the Divine Mercy, the ſmaller committed by invincible ignorance, inadvertency or unavoydable infirmity, ſhall not be imputed to thoſe who love God.* Anſw. Firſt, if theſe ſins be damnable in the Unregenerate, as Infidels and thoſe who want Faith; I ſee not why they are not Damnable alſo in the Regenerate; for theſe by reaſon of the great knowledge they have of Chriſtian Profeſſion, ſeem more obliged upon that very account to avoid venial ſins, then Infidels or the Unregenerate. 2. I Argue thus: Doctor *Taylor* is (we'll ſuppoſe it) a man who loves God; we'll ſuppoſe alſo, what he ſaith, page 95. is true; *That no man lives without the intromiſſion of venial ſins daily*; from whence it follows that Doctor *Taylor* hath ſuch a heap of evils in his Soul, which (though he

he loves God) of their own Nature, and the rigor of Gods Juſtice may damn him for ever. If ſo, I ask why Gods Juſtice (overcome as it were by Mercy) is leſs ſevere to theſe ſins, then to others which we call great and Mortal? No Reaſon can be given, but that thoſe leſſer ſins are venial, pardonable in their own Nature; theſe greater deſerve the ſeverity of his Juſtice. Pardonable I ſay they are, and little, antecedently to Gods Juſtice and Mercy, and therefore mercy makes them not ſo, but finds them pardonable, becauſe little.

Hence it follows, that no heap of venial ſins *conſidered as venial*, can equalize the gravity of one Mortal offence; for though the growth and numerous augmentation of them add more miſery to a Soul; yet their increaſe is (as Divines ſpeak) *in inferiori ordine* in a lower Degree of Malice, and reach no more to the enormity of a mortal ſin, (which make us enemies to God) then a thouſand idle words reach the indignity of high Treaſon againſt a Prince or Soveraign. I ſay *conſidered as venial*, for if the careleſs multiplying of venial ſins drive us on to the next ſtep or danger of offending mortally; the caſe is altered; *Qui amat periculum peribit in eo. He that loves danger ſhall periſh in it.*

The Doctor adds pag. 107 (*That this Doctrine of ſins venial gives reſt to mens conſciences: and that concerning ſuch ſins we are bidden to be quiet*) I anſwer, His miſtake is notorious. We inculcate, God knows, the danger of thoſe leſſer evils, we lay open their Malice, and ſay, That *for every idle word an account muſt be given* before a ſevere Judge. O but ſaies he, *'Tis impoſſible to tell in a thouſand caſes which are, and which are not venial ſins:* And pag. (108) *If a Confeſſor ſays that's venial which is mor-*

mortal, your Soul is betrayed. Why ſo good Doctor? I anſwer then: The penitents duty is not perfectly to know what is, and what is not venial; but to have hearty ſorrow for his ſins committed, whether great or little. For no man ſaith I grieve for my ſins as *little* or only venial; but moſt *ſecurely* thus: I am ſorry for them all, as God knows them offenſive to his Divine Majeſty: And anſwerable to this ſorrow the Confeſſor gives abſolution; therefore though his knowledge may in ſome caſes fail, and not rightly diſtinguiſh between ſins mortal and venial; yet his abſolution is good, for he abſolves from all, whereof the Penitent humbly contrite, accuſeth himſelf guilty.

CHAP. XVI.

Divines prudently follow in innumerable caſes a probable Opinion. Of the Doctors exceptions againſt it. Of his miſtakes.

THE Doctor pag. 110. Sect. 7. lays about him to undo our *Leading men* concerning the Doctrine they hold of a probable Opinion. Briefly, The Judgment of Divines is this: That if an Opinion well examined by learned men, be not contrary to known received Doctrine, or any deciſion of the Church, it may be ſafely followed in practice; and this, though one grave Doctor ſays it; Provided, I ſay, that

that his Judgment be not oppoſite to the general received Doctrine of others.

The ground of this aſſertion is: Innumerable difficulties dayly occur in a Moral life relating to the practice of Vertue, to the ſhunning of ſin, to the doing of Juſtice; In fine, to a Chriſtian mans Obligation in a thouſand caſes; which difficulties can with no evidence be decided either by Scripture, or definition of the Church. Divines therefore, who are ſuppoſed both rational and beſt verſed in the Principles of Chriſtian Religion unavoydably muſt, when evidence cannot be had, opinatively Judge and give a probable deciſion to the doubts propoſed: and this I think neither our Doctor, nor any Proteſtant living can deny. For,

If a Judge comes to Doctor *Taylor* and tells him, Sir, this very day I am to pronounce Sentence againſt a ſuppoſed Delinquent, or muſt free him. To give ſentence againſt him I have Accuſers enough, and plenty of Witneſſes: None can except againſt them, their proofs will make him guilty; yet I know moſt certainly by my private knowledge that the man is innocent; my difficulty now is, whether as a publick perſon and Judge, I may condemn him as guilty upon the atteſtation of theſe publick Witneſſes, or quit him (though to my prejudice) on the certain knowledge I have of his innocency. What will the Doctor ſay to this caſe? will he plead ignorance? He cannot; for both in his Books and Sermons he takes upon him to decide the greateſt Controverſies in Faith; and therefore of neceſſity muſt here anſwer a difficulty in practice: let him ſay what he pleaſeth, he can do no more, but follow a probable Opinion; for if he counſels the Judge to free this ſuppoſed delinquent, he hath a whole Army of School-men againſt him, if to con-

condemn him, he hath as many contrary; none of theſe Doctors can be ſuppoſed to ſpeak againſt the evidence of truth; therefore they only deliver their probable Opinions, and ſo muſt our Doctor do likewiſe if he ſpeaks with either one ſide or other.

A thouſand ſuch caſes are almoſt endleſly propoſed, where the Wit of man muſt reſt upon probability, without reaching to evidence in every particular caſe; only this reflex evidence we have, that none can ſin who follows *the dictamen of Prudence*. But he that adheres to a probable Opinion follows Prudence, (when evidence cannot be had) therefore he is blamleſs and ſins not. yet,

One word more with our Doctor, who (pag. 79.) talks of ſomething, *Their Writers have often proved in their Sermons and Books of Conſcience*. I ask him therefore, ſeeing they have ſuch books; whether there Writers reſolve every particular caſe of conſcience upon certain undoubted Principles of Faith: if he ſays no; then they have probable Opinions among them alſo. If, yes; This very ſaying is at moſt no more then probable; and will be (upon ſolid Reaſons) contradicted by a hundred as Learned Schollers as the Doctor is; therefore he muſt decide the caſe upon a prudent Opinion, and probability only. Yet more.

Can the Doctor perſwade himſelf that all he ſaith in his Book runs on with ſuch evidence, that a judicious Reader muſt hold it demonſtrative? No. The moſt he can think, is that he diſcourſeth probably; and yet, by this meer probability he hopes to diſſwade the World from Popery. I ſay the moſt *he can think*; for I profeſs (and I have thouſands will Judge with me) there is not ſo much as one Section in it that comes neer a probability. Conclude then from hence; that if as the Doctor ſaith,

page 111. *It be not ſafe to follow* Caius *and* Sempronious *in a probable Opinion, becauſe they are but private Doctors*; Much leſs is it ſafe to follow Doctor *Taylor in his* Diſſwaſive from Popery, (who at moſt ſpeaks but probably) and is no more but a private Doctor. What he adds at the end of this page, viz. *That we ſuffer caſuiſts to determine caſes ſeverely, and gently: Entertain all ſpirits: Pleaſe all diſpoſitions, and Govern them by their own inclinations, as they liſt to be governed*; &c. Is in a word, a long liſt of miſtakes; and the Doctor is obliged in conſcience (by more then a probable Opinion) to unſay the ſlander.

Now to ſome famous Quotations of our Doctor; who though he could ſhew that thoſe particular Opinions which he cavils at in the enſuing part of his Section, were as falſe as that impious Doctrine is *of killing Kings*, or Durands *Opinion of Fornication*; yet he gains nothing: for all at moſt he proves, is that *ſuch* and *ſuch* particular Opinions are to be caſt aſide; which God knows, makes little to decry the Doctrine of a probable Opinion *in general*. Five or ſix Miniſters in *England*, (and perhaps more) are worth little; is therefore their whole Miniſtry in general not to be valued.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

How the Doctor wrongs both the Canon Law and Catholick Authors. Of his Quotations unworthily corrupted.

OUr Doctor cites page 112. *Emanuel* Sa in his Aphoriſms *verbo. dubium.* for this Doctrine; viz. *If one Doctor ſay it is ſafe to ſwear a thing as of our knowledge which we do not know, but believe it is ſo, it is therefore probable that it is lawful to ſwear it.* Anſw. *Eman.* Sa in this word *Dubium*, (with me printed at *Antwerp* 1599.) hath not one word of ſwearing (in which is particular difficulty) but *numero* 3. ſpeaks thus: *Poteſt quis facere quod probabili ratione, vel authoritate putet licere, etiamſi oppoſitum ſit tutius. One may do what he thinks probable by Reaſon or Authority, though the contrary be more ſafe.* What is here of ſafety to ſwear a thing as of our knowledge, which we do not know?

Antonius de Eſcobar, Whom the Doctor ſhould have cited thus: *Lib.* 2. *Theol. Moralis cap.* 2. *De conſcientia probabili*, hath not a ſyllable of *Swearing* by any Warrant of a probable Opinion; but rather

the contrary. *Moneo*, ſayes he, *n.*15. *haud licere uti probabili Opinione, quando ex eâ magnum periculum ſequeretur, vel proximi damni*, &c. *I put you in mind, that it is not lawful to uſe a probable Opinion, when either great danger or hurt of our Neighbour may follow on it*; which may eaſily fall out, if we ſwear a thing as *of our knowledge, which we know not.*

He tells you ſoon after a ſtory of Pope *Conſtantine the 4th. who being accuſed in the Lateran Council for holding the See Apoſtolick when he was not in Orders, juſtified himſelf by the Example of two Biſhops*: And he cites *Nauclerus* for the ſtory *Generatione* 21. & 26. Anſwer. Firſt, *Nauclerus Generat.* 21. hath not one word of Pope *Conſtantine*, much leſs this ſtory: *Generat.* 26. (with me, page 9.) he ſpeaks thus: *Perſtitit autem per annum in Petri Cathedra Conſtantinus, & Epiſcopos Præsbiteroſque more Pontificum ordinavit, quouſque clero Populoque Romano in tribus foris —— Conſtantinus eſt ejectus, & in ejus locum omnium ſuffragiis Stephanus* 3. *extitit ſuffectus*, &c. Conſtantine *continued in the Chair of* Peter *for a year, and ordained Biſhops and Prieſts, as Popes were accuſtomed; until the Clergy and People of* Rome *aſſembled in there ſeveral places*, &c. —— Conſtantine *was caſt out, and by the Votes of all,* Stephen *was ſet in his place.* Here is nothing of the *Lateran* Council, or the pretended Example of two Biſhops. You may ſee therefore how unlucky our Doctor is in his citations. 2. I anſwer, Admit that *Conſtantine* alledged the Example of two Biſhops, were either he or they on that account good or laudable? no certainly: ſuch preſidents make no probable Opinion.

Next

Next he cites you Cardinal *Campegius* and *Alber. Pighius* teaching, *That a Prieſt lives more holily that keeps a Concubine, then he that hath Married a Wife.* Anſw. Obſerve, firſt, I beſeech you, how our Doctor cites you theſe Authors without their places. Obſerve, 2. How he juggles in that word, *He*, which muſt relate either to a Secular man that may Marry; or to a *Græcian* Prieſt that is Married before his Prieſt-hood; or finally, to a Latin Prieſt that cannot Marry, either *Licite*, or *Validè* without diſpenſation. Hence I infer: whoever affirms that a Prieſt lives more holily that keeps a Concubine, then a ſecular man that may Marry, or a *Græcian* Prieſt that was Married before Orders, delivers moſt impious Doctrine (*Pighius* never ſaid it.) Again, whoever affirmes, that a Prieſt that keeps a Concubine lives more holily then a Prieſt that Marrieth; talks *De ſubjecto non ſupponendo*, for a Latin Prieſt cannot Marry. If he therefore be ſo damnably wicked as to Marry a hundred times, his ſuppoſed Wife is no more but a Concubine; and then the Doctors Wiſe allegation muſt make this ſence: That Prieſt *lives more holily that keeps a Concubine, then he that hath a Concubine.* Perhaps *Pighius* may ſay, that if a Prieſt endeavours to Marry a Wife, as *Luther* did, and owns that Sacrilegious contract as a Marriage; To his impure living with a Harlot, he adds a new ſin: And this Doctrine is true.

The Doctor goes on in the next lines: *Seeing we find in the Popes Laws that a Prieſt is not to be removed for Fornication; Who will not, or may not practically conclude, that ſince by the Law of God Mariage is Holy, and yet to ſome men Fornication*

is

is more Lawful; that therefore to keep a Concubine is very Lawful. Answ. Let the Doctor speak out plainly, and tell us to what men Fornication is more Lawful then Marriage: It is absolutely unlawful in all; and therefore, if we speak properly, Fornication admits no Degree of being more or less Lawful. Had the Doctor said, the sacrilegious Fornication of a Preist is a lesser evil then sacrilegiously to use and own a Woman as his Wife, he had spoken sence: But hence it follows not, that to keep a Concubine *is very Lawful.* Nay if (*per impossibile*) Fornication were in some cases Lawful, it doth not yet follow, that to keep a Concubine *is very lawful*: In a word, the Doctor says he knows not what.

Now to the Popes Laws, which he cites so confusedly, that no man understands him: He Writes in his Margent thus: 3. *quæst.* 7. which *Canonists* would take for *Causa* 3. *q.* 7. (but then the Chapter should be added) not one word of this Subject in that *quæst.*7. Then he adds, *lata*, which should signifie the beginning of a Chapter: Where to find it no man knows, nor whether it relates to *quæst.* 7. or the *Extravag.* Next follows, *Extravag. de Bigamis.* There is nothing *de bigamis* in the *Extravag.* in *decret. tit.* 21. There is *de bigamis non ordinandis*, *cap.* 5. yet nothing to this purpose; and I dare boldly affirm that in all the Canon Law, he shall not find either that Doctrine he attributes to *Albertus Pighius*, or *That Fornication is more Lawful then Marriage in any.* I wonder why the Doctor when he cites *Campegius* and *Pighius* for that filthy Doctrine *of a Priests living more holily with a Concubine, then he that's Married*; places directly against it, in his Margent the Canon Law; *distinct.* 82. *can. Præsbiter*

biter in gloſſa, as if the Doctrine were allowed of. In a word, there is no ſuch thing, but expreſly the contrary. The words are thus: *Cap. 5. Presbiter. Si Fornicationem feceret, quanquam ſecundum canones Apoſtolorum debeat deponi: tamen, juxta Authoritatem Beati Papæ ſilveſtri, ſi in vitio non perduraverit, ſed ſua ſponte confeſſus adjecit, ut reſargat, decem annis in hunc modum pœniteat tribus quidem menſibus privato loco a cæteris remotus, pane, & aqua, a veſpera in veſperam utatur. A Prieſt, if he commits Fornication, although by the Canon of the Apoſtles he is to be depoſed, yet according to St.* Sylveſters *appointment, if he perſever not in that ſtate of ſinning, but having confeſſed willingly, amends his life, he is to do Penance for ten years in this manner. For the firſt three Months he is to live a part from others, and from Evening to Evening have only Bread and water*, &c. And ſtill that Chapter goes on preſcribing further and moſt ſevere Penances to ſuch a Delinquent. Read I beſeech you the whole Chapter, and never leave off to admire our miſtaken Doctor.

Page 113. he cites *Durandus: Sent. lib. 4. diſtinct. 33.* (but gives you not the Queſtion under the Diſtinction.) Well, he means *quæſt. 2.* towards the end. *Durandus* his words are: *Quod autem quidam dicant, quod eſt peccatum mortale de ſe, (nempe Fornicatio) excluſâ omni lege poſitivâ, Divinâ & humanâ, non bene intelligo. But for what ſome ſay, that Fornication by it ſelf is a mortal ſin excluding all poſitive Law Divine and humane: I well underſtand not.* Thus *Durandus*: And though his, *non bene intelligo*, be not aſſertive; yet he ſaith too much; and is therefore contradicted by the generality of moſt Learned Doctors. His Opinion then (according to the Rule given above) is not probable.

ble. One Swallow makes no Summer, nor one Divine againſt the general received Doctrine of others, makes no probable Opinion.

Next he cites *Martinus de Magiſtris* aſſerting, that it is not Heretical, to believe ſimple Fornication to be no ſin. Anſw. I have not now that Author by me; but yet believe, that the Doctor wrongs him. If he held ſuch a Tenet; I ſay it is Heretical, and conſequently no probable Opinion. Perhaps he may favour *Durands* Error too much, and that's all: I little regard what *Daniel Tilenus* ſaies, he was an Heretick, and Writ a Book that the Pope of *Rome* is *magnus ille & proprie dictus Antichriſtus*. I think the Doctor will not ſay ſo.

Next the Doctor cites Cardinal *Tolet. Inſtruct. ſacerd. lib. 5. cap. 6. num.* 15. Saying, *That if a Noble man be ſet upon, and may eſcape by going away, he is not tyed to it, but may kill him that intends to ſtrike him with a ſtick.* Anſw. The Doctor mangles *Tolets* Doctrine, and wrongs him exceedingly; whoſe words are: *Ex quo ſit, ut ſi nobilis invaſus poſſit vitam ſalvare fugiendo; non tenetur, (ſi inde infamiam contrahit) fugere, ſed occidere hoſtem poteſt, ſi aliter vitam cum honore tutari non poteſt. Whence it follows that if a Noble man ſet on, might ſave his life by running away, he is not obliged to it, if he gets infamy by his running away; but may kill the aggreſſor, if otherwiſe, he cannot defend his life with Honour.* Now comes the ſtick: *Similiter ſi non poteſt fugere injuriam notabilem inferendam, ut ligni percuſſionem paratam, poteſt etiam tunc occidere inimicum. In like manner if this Noble man cannot avoid a notable injury, ready for him, as is a Baſtinado, or a ſtroke with a Cudgel*

be

he may then kill his Enemy. Compare theſe words of *Tolet* with thoſe of the Doctor, and you'll ſee a difference.

Tolet ſaith again, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 13. (ſaith the Doctor) *That if a man without advertency ſpeaks a blaſphemy in a ſtrong paſſion, not conſidering what he ſays, ſins not.* Anſw. Yet he adds: *Niſi cum homo eſſet aſſuetus Blaſphemare, nec vult emendationem: talis enim peccaret mortaliter tunc, quia eſt in culpâ præcedenti quia non abſtulit occaſionem peccati. Unleſs ſuch a man were accuſtomed to Blaſpheme and will not amend; for then he would ſin mortally in the precedent fault, and becauſe he took not away the occaſion of ſin.* Theſe words the Doctor omits, to make *Tolets* Doctrine odious, which yet is grounded in this certain Principle; that as ſin is a free act; ſo it muſt ariſe from a knowledge or advertency of that evil, the will voluntary embraſeth. Hence you may ſolve that other Quotation out of *Tolet*, *lib.* 5. *cap.* 10. viz. *If a man be beaſtly drunk and then commits Fornication, Fornication is no ſin; ſolve it I ſay;* for the uſe of Reaſon is requiſite to every ſin; here is no uſe of Reaſon, *Ergo*, no ſin. And pray you, will the Doctor ſay that *Lot* ſinned mortally, when ſo drunk as he was; he committed Inceſt with his Daughters: Or will he hang a meer natural Sot in *England*, (who hath not Reaſon to know good from evil) for ſtealing thirteen pence half-penny? I would have this caſe plainly reſolved by the Doctor, if he holds that *Lot* ſinned mortally, and his reſolution brought to a clear and certain Principle; for if he gives not evidence in the deciſion of the caſe againſt *Tolet*, he can not by his own Rule make uſe of a probable Opinion.

Once more *Tolet* is cited, page 114. for saying *lib.* 5. *cap.* 13. *If a man desires Carnal polution that he may be eased of his Carnal temptations, or for his health, it were no sin.* Answ. He highly abuseth *Tolet*; who speaks of no Lascivious or Carnal desire; so far is he from this, that he saith; if one takes complacency in it, *Ob delectationem, for the delight had*, he sinneth mortally; and then adds: *Dico ob delectationem, quia complacere ob sanitatem, vel, ut carnales tentationes non sint ita vehementes, non esset peccatum. I say for delight, for to be glad of it for health, or that carnal tentations be not so violent, it is no sin.* The end or motive is here far different; but to desire or delight in that filthy act, is ever a sin and mortal.

Yet one citation more remains of *Eman.* Sa which will make the Doctor famous; he referrs us to Sa, *Tit. debitum conjugale n.* 6. who (saith he) affirms, that if a *man lyes with his intended wife before Marriage, it is no sin, or a light one only.* Answ. Hear, I beseech you, Sa his own words in my Edition printed at *Antwerp anno* 1599. (and never cease to wonder at what the Doctor saith) *n.* 6. *Copulari ante benedictionem aut nullum, aut lene peccatum est, (& si quidam mortale esse putant) quin etiam expedit, si multum illa (Benedictio) differatur.* That is, *For a man and wife to lye together now married, before the Solemn Benediction of the Sacrament* (not before Marriage as our Doctor unworthily tells yee) *although some think it a mortal sin, is not so*, but at most venial. *Yes, its sometimes expedient, if Benediction be put off for a long time, that they live together as Man and Wife*; Did you ever hear of a Doctor that doth not distinguish betwixt the *Sacrament* of Marriage, and the *Benediction* of the Married couple? Thus much of the seventh Section.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of Attention neceſſary in prayer. One may pray that perfectly underſtands not the words of prayer. The Doctor quotes amiſs, and abuſeth Suarez.

THe Doctor in his 8, and 9th. Section hath much ſleight work, and his 10th. Section is a ſtory of Exorciſms. Of theſe a word. In paſſing I muſt not omit to make him memorable for his quotations, you know this is my chiefeſt taſk.

Pag. 117. Sect. 8. he ſaith. *They teach, (we Catholicks,) that prayers themſelves* ex opere operato, *or by natural work it ſelf, do prevail, for it is not eſſential to prayer, for a man to think particularly of what he ſayes; or, of the things ſignified by the words* : So, (ſaith he) *Suarez* teaches. And where think you? *lib.* 3. *de Oratione cap.* 4. ſayes the Doctor. Briefly. He ſhould firſt have cited the Tome, and the general Title of it thus; *Tomo* 2. *de Statu Religionis* before he came to the Book and chapter, but we will pardon this Leſſer Fault, and complain of a greater, and it is, that he wrongs *Suarez* unpardonably. *Suarez* ſayes no where in that whole chapter, (nor any Author I ever read) that prayers prevail *ex opere operato*, or by the *work it ſelf done*, as the Sacraments prevail. He excludes no where attention, but requires it in prayer. Hear this Learned Authour *num.* 3. (in the chapter now cited.) *Imprimis neceſſariam eſſe attentionem ut oratio honeſte fiat, communis eſt ſententia doctorum. Firſt that attention is neceſſary, that prayer be*

well done, is the common opinion of Doctors, and this not onely in prayers we have of obligation, but in others alſo not obligatory; for, although (ſaith he) *we are not obliged to pray* (*in ſuch, and ſuch circumſtances,*) *yet if we do it, we are bound to pray* debito modo *in a dutiful way and manner.* He adds more to this purpoſe, *Num.* 4. and *Num.* 5. concludes, that that vocal prayer, or ſpeaking to Almighty God which is made without mental attention is no prayer at all. Whence it follows that who prayes, muſt either attend to what he ſayes, or have his mind ſo devoutly elevated to Almighty God that his prayers prove acceptable: for if that known Maxim be true, *Diviſum cor non impetrat quod petit: a heart divided in prayer* (*that is, partly in Heaven, partly in earth*) *gets little*, much more a heart which attends to no good thing when we pray, doth the work without fruit. Attention therefore is even neceſſary, actual, or virtual, whereof ſee *Suarez* Num. 7.

To what the Doctor oppoſeth next after, thus: *Nay, it is not neceſſary to the eſſence of prayer that he who prayes ſhould think* de ipſa locutione, *of the ſpeaking it ſelf.* *Suarez* anſwers from his Number 15. to the end of the chapter. His diſcourſe is long, I'le therefore give you the ſubſtance of his reſolution by propoſing to our Doctor one or two queſtions. Suppoſe, Dr. *Taylor* hath made to himſelf a ſet form of prayer which he knows moſt perfectly, and ſayes it before his Sermon, yet now and then ſurpriſed by an unvoluntary diſtraction thinks not *de ipſa locutione.* I aſk whither the fruit of ſuch prayer is loſt, and the eſſence of it periſh? if he ſays yes, he ſpeaks a paradox, and muſt either conclude that few Miniſters pray to

the

the purpoſe; or tell us a ſtrange ſtory, that they are never diſtracted in prayer.

Yet more, ſuppoſe Dr. *Taylor* while he ſaith his prayer, hath his mind ſo deeply fixed on Almighty God that (though his tongue ſpeaks) he thinks not of the ſpeaking, but of God onely, and his immenſe goodneſs: Will he alſo ſay that his prayer is worth nothing? Tis impious to think it. Now hear *Suarez* at the end of his 17. number, and obſerve how he is abuſed. *Non eſt*, (ſaith he) *de ratione orationis, ut cogitet orans de ipſa locutione, ſed, ſatis eſt ſi cogitet de Deo cum quo loquitur.* *'Tis, not of the eſſence of prayer to think of the ſpeaking, but it is enough that he who prayes think of Almighty God with whom he ſpeaks*; for *here is aſcenſio mentis ad Deum the lifting up of our heart to God*, therefore true prayer. This of prayer in general, for thoſe who have a ſet forme of prayer preſcribed, (as Prieſts have) *Suarez* num. 19. requires a decent attention to the words, according to that of the Wiſe man. *Ne temerè quid loquaris &c.*

I muſt not quite omit that other cavil of our Doctor; *It is not neceſſary* (ſaith he) *out of Suarez to think of the things ſignified by the words.* *Anſw.* God forbid it ſhould be neceſſary; for if our Doctor ſhould pray *for Urim and Thummim, and to have his tongue touch'd with a coal from the Altar, and that God would bleſs him, and his, from that Empuſe that met* Apollonius Tyanæus, *and all remnants of embrodery from the* Theopneuſt Aholiah, *and finally from the pride of Popes ſtigmatiz'd by a prolepſis*: Few I believe, and very few who pray with him, would think (becauſe they

Such is the dark Language of D. *Taylor* and D. *Pierce.*

understand not) of the things signified by these words; Yet, they pray, or do not pray: *Angustiæ undique.* If the first: poor people may pray though they know not the thing signified by words. If they do not pray, all is vanity when they kneel down at such a prayer, and say *Amen* to it. The Doctor may say, they use no such language in prayer. *Anſ.* They use worse in preaching, witness Dr. *Pierce's late Sermon*, whereof, part at least might by some industrie be turned into a long prayer, with all its pedantry and vain affectation. If so; I seriously ask whether a hundred old women, who heard such a prayer, said at *Paul's* Cross, and pray according to the sence of it; pray, or no? if they do, old women may pray when they understand not things signify'd by words: if they do not, they pray not, yet say *Amen* to all.

I dare avouch it with certainty, that there is not a Cobler, or Taylor in our Catholick Town here, who do not better understand the whole substance of *Mass*, (though in *Latin*,) then the generality of *English* men understand Dr. *Pierce's* Sermon. Yet 'tis printed for the profit of all. Be it so or not, I justify by the example now given, and good reason against the Doctor, that prayer in an unknown Language though the thing signified by the words be not perfectly understood, is allowable, and looses nothing of the essence of prayer: I prove it thus.

Such a prayer known by the authority of the Church, and consent of virtuous men to be good and pious, (though in an unknown Language,) may be offered up by an ignorant man, both to praise Almighty God, and to petition his Divine Majesty for a grace and favour; just as one not knowing Latin, may

may prefer a Petition to the Pope in that Language, which containes both praiſe due to ſo great a Prelat, and withall begg's a boon or favour of him. Here is our very Caſe. The unlearned man knows not perfectly the Latin Service; no more doth this ignorant Suppliant know his Latin Petition. The firſt is aſſured by the greateſt authority imaginable, that the Latin Service aſcribes prayſe and thanks-giving to God, and begg's a favour of him; The ſecond is aſſured, ('tis true by a leſſer authority,) that his Petition runs on in the like nature; if therefore this man who knows not Latin, may petition (and with hope of grace) a Pope, or Prince in Latin; never ſhall the Doctor ſhew why an ignorant man may not alſo petition Almighty God in the ſame Language; let the Doctor here give me but a ſhadow of any diſparity, and he ſhall be an *Apollo*.

Were it not over tedious, I might give you (with the learned *Suarez*) the true reaſon of this doctrin, briefly in words or writings, you may diſtinguiſh a twofold ſignification. The firſt is more general, the ſecond may be called *ſpecifical*, or if you pleaſe *individual*. The general ſignification is had, when we know that ſuch a prayer is good, pious, and laudable: But to have perfectly the ſpecifical, we muſt know the ſenſe and meaning of the words. To pray therefore well, this knowledge is required, that the prayer is a good and pious petition, and as ſuch, (uniting my ſelf with all faithful Chriſtians) I offer it up to Almighty God, though I comprehend not the ultimate *ſpecifical* or *individual* ſignification of it. May not I beſeech you our Doctor ſay thoſe words of the Royal Prophet *Pſal.* 68. and prayſe Almigh-

ty God by them; *Si dormiatis inter medios cleros, pennæ columbæ deargentatæ* &c. Though perhaps he knows not perfectly the ſpecifical ſignification of them? Yes, and ſo may an old woman do, when ſhe hears her Miniſter pray for *Urim* and *Thummim*, *or to have his tongue touch'd with a coal*, &c.

Add to this, (and 'tis worth reflection,) that beſide the general knowledge poor Idiots have of the piety in Latin Service, innumerable by continual uſe come to a ſpecifical knowledge of moſt things ſaid in holy Maſs: and more your poor Idiots in *England* know not, either of thoſe wordy extemporal prayers made by Miniſters, or of their affected and fruitleſs Sermons. No *Chryſoſtome*, no *Ambros*, no *Auſtin* ever preach'd or pray'd like them. But what will you? Novelty in doctrin brings with it theſe *new nothings* in morality.

CHAP. XIX.

The Doctor yet holds on in quoting Authours amiſs. His Errors are diſcovered.

THE Doctor next cites you *Salmeron* ſaying, *that prayers prevail when they are not underſtood like the words of a charmer. Anſw.* Where ſaith *Salmeron* this? The Doctor points to no place, nor can he I believe; if he cannot, he both charms and cheats his Reader. He cites next S. *Antoninus ſummæ, part.* 3. *tit.* 23.

tit. 23. *Anſw.* That 23. title hath five long Chapters under it, and every Chapter is yet further ſubdivided into ſeveral members, ſections, or paragraphs, and our Doctor neither gives you Chapter, nor paragraph, where we may find *that prayer is like a pretious ſtone in the hand of an unskilfull man*: Nor can he I think, for that 23. title treats *de conciliis univerſalibus, de differentia Papæ, & concilii*, a matter remote enough from handling what prayer is. Well, but admit S. *Antoninus* ſay ſo, there is nothing reprehenſible: The ſimilitude is good, if the unſkilful man knows as well in general, that he hath a pretious ſtone in his hand, as the unlearned man that his prayer is pious.

The Doctor pag. 118 remits us to *Jacobus de Graffiis de orat.* *Anſw.* I have 3. Tomes in a large 4to. of this Author, and peruſing the Index of the Title he hath in each Tome, I find none *de oratione.* Yet, *part.* 1. *deciſio*: *Aurearum lib.* 2. *cap.* 52. *he propoſeth this queſtion*: *Qualiter dicendæ horæ canonicæ? how our Canonical hours are to be ſaid*, and he reſolves the queſtion thus; *num.* 3. *Ut animus ſit in divino officio attentus, hoc eſt, ut mentem habeat præſentem ad id, quod dicitur, nempe ut quod lingua foris perſonat, mens ſimul intus concipiendo loquatur, unde Auguſtinus*: *Hoc verſetur in corde, quod proferatur ore.* That is, *that the mind be attentive in the Divine Office, and it be preſent to what is ſaid, that what the tongue ſpeaks the heart conceives, according to S.* Auſtin; *Let the heart ſpeak, what we ſay in words.* Thus much I cite out of *Graffys* to prove that the Doctors illation is far from truth, in the beginning of his 118. pag. *Therefore attention or devotion in our prayers is not neceſſary.*

Imme-

Immediatly after he quotes Cardinal *Tolet lib. 2. de inſtruct. Sacerd. cap. 13.* whoſe words are theſe, *Circa modum*, &c. *concerning the manner (how we are to ſay our Canonical hours,) it is to be obſerved, that every one ſay them attentively, reverently*, and *devoutly*. Next he ſhews particularly what attention is requiſit, and ſaith in the ſecond place that advertency to the ſence of the words is not neceſſary, and he affirms this moſt truly, for few old women in *England* can attend to the ſence of every word ſaid by their Miniſter, becauſe they *know it not*.

Mark now a moſt ſtrange illation of our Doctor, *ſo that*, ſaith he, *by this doctrin no attention is neceſſary*. *Tolet* ſayes, *We are to ſay our Canonical hours attentively, devoutly, and reverently*, and the Doctor infers; that *no attention is neceſſary*. Whether ſuch an unworthy dealing, with ſo learned a man as *Tolet* was, be tollerable, let the world judge.

The Doctor pag. 120. would even tire a patient man with his tattle. *They in England*, ſaith he, *pray with the heart*, *We* (the Church of *Rome*) *with our lips*, *They pray*, *We ſay prayers*, &c. And what good Doctor do we ſay them without a heart? who made you judge of this *forum*? The ſecrets of hearts are only known to God, (not to Angels) much leſs to any poor *ſpirit* in *England*. What follows in that 8th. Section is onely talk without ſubſtance. And,

Truly his. 9th. Section is like it; though worſe, for blaſphemies againſt the Mother of God, and the bleſſed Saints in Heaven. The Doctor about pag. 33. tells us, that Scripture expreſly forbids us to enquire of the dead, but here he is more then inquiſitive, for he takes upon him to judge, to degrade, and caſt out of Heaven

Heaven many a happy ſoul; witneſs his pag. 133. I paſs by his jeers, and blaſphemies, (they are all numbred by one that errs not,) and take notice only of two or three quotations.

Pag. 124. he cites you S. *Antoninus Sum. part.* 4. *tit.* 15. *without either chapter, number, or further direction. Whereas that* 15th. *title*, in an old cloſe abreviated character, contains about 60. whole leaves in *folio*, which if printed in ſuch a letter as the Doctors *Diſſuaſive* is, would well make two, or more of it. I chiefly doubt whether S. *Antoninus* be fairly dealt with, cited for theſe words. *How ſhall a ſinner go to Chriſt as to an advocate?* but cannot now run over ſo large a Treatiſe to find the truth. In the interim the Doctor may bluſh to paint his margent with ſuch confuſed quotations. A child may ſee, he either read not *Antoninus*, or, minded not his Reader ſhould meet with the place.

Soon after he cites *F. Salazar in cap.* 8. *Proverb. in ver.* 19. Saying, *that the Virgin* Mary *by offering up Chriſt was worthy to have, (after a certain manner) that the whole ſalvation and redemption of mankind ſhould be aſcribed to her, and that this was common to Chriſt and the Virgin. Anſw.* The Doctor deales moſt diſingenioufly with *Salazar*, who *numb.* 206. *num.* 19. *layes this Principle, Exploratum eſt illud apud Catholicos Virginem noſtræ ſalutis principalem cauſam minime fuiſſe, (ſolus enim Chriſtus rem totam peregit) pro peccatorum debito integre ſatis dando, ſed tantum, ſua impetratione eandem ſalutem quodammodo, promoviſſe, & juvaſſe. It is known to all Catholicks that the Virgin no way was the principal Cauſe of our Salvation. (Chriſt alone did that work and paid our*

ranſom fully) but only by her impetration ſhe promoted, in ſome ſort, *and ſet forward that ſalvation.*

S. *Hierom* cited by *Salazar*, *numb.* 204. ſays more, and calls the Virgin, *ſalutis auctricem.* S. *Anſelm reparatricem.* S. *Ireneus*, *univerſo generi humano cauſa ſalutis*, &c. *Salazar* therefore, grounding himſelf upon theſe, and other authorities of Fathers, and pondering the great oblation the *Virgin* made of her only Son, concludes num. 222. *Hæc cum ita ſint ob tantam tamque inſignem, tantique valoris, ac meriti actionem. Virgo Dei-para digna fuit ut illi communis totius generis humani ſalus, & redemptio, aliquo modo adſcriberetur*: that is, *For that worthy and noble action ſhe did, in offering up her Son to his eternal Father, ſhe may be ſtyled (with S.* Hierom) *the Actreſs of our ſalvation, and accounted ſo worthy, that the common ſafety and redemption of all mankind might, in* ſome manner, *be aſcribed to her.* Which is not, (God knows) to ſay as our Doctor ſtrangely interprets, that this redemption *was common to Chriſt and the Virgin. Chriſt was the ſole and principal cauſe of our redemption, he alone did the work*, ſaith *Salazar*, and under this notion the Virgin had nothing common with him. You ſee how conſtant the Doctor is, in wronging Authors.

I ſhould have told you how our Doctor before he cites *Salazar* talks of ſtrange blaſphemies, delivered by *Bernardinus de Buſtis*, and *Valentia*, but gives you no particular; an anſwer is ready when he produceth them: in the interim let him know that *fraudulenti verſantur in univerſalibus*, cheats like well to ſculk in generalities, and that all is not blaſphemy the Doctor jeers at.

CHA?

CHAP. XX.

Of recourſe had by the Living to the Saints in Heaven for temporal Neceſſities. S. Auſtin *warrants this Practice. S.* Gregory Niſſen *approves it. Of Miracles done in our age.*

MUch patience I confeſs is neceſſary to read our Doctor, and more to loſe time in weighing his unweighty arguments. Yet go on we muſt. In his 9th Section therefore, page chiefly 123. He tyres you with a few old trivial objections againſt *invocation of Saints*, made long ſince by others, &, God knows, anſwer'd by *Bellarmine* before the Doctor was born, though he talks, as if they were the *new Lights* of his own learning, never thought on by any body elſe. He argues firſt, *We have no command, no teſtimony, no promiſe in Scripture for the invocation of Saints. Bellarmin* anſwers *Tom.* 2. *de Sanctorum Beatit. lib.* 1. *cap* 20. *§. argumentum ſextum*; and ſaith well, *the argument proves too much, viz.* That Saints cannot pray in general for the good of the Church, which yet Proteſtants grant. He argues. 2. *prayer to Saints leſſens our honour to Chriſt, deſtroys our confidence in God. Anſw.* If ſo, we cannot pray for one another here on earth, without leſſening Chriſts honour, and weakning our confidence towards God. See *Bellar. lib. Citato cap.* 20. *§. argumentum ſecundum & cap.* 19. *§. preterea in utroque teſtamento.* He objects 3. *We cannot know how our prayers come to the knowledge of Saints in Heaven. Bellarmine* anſwers *eodem*

cap. 20. *§. argumentum tertium*, and *§. de modo aut*: Shews you by four opinions of Doctors, how Saints may hear our prayers. I think the Doctor will not deny, that the bleſſed ſoul of our *Saviour* in Heaven hears our prayers (I ſpeak of his ſanctified created ſoul, not of his Divinity every where preſent,) if this can be explicated, all difficulty ceaſeth; well may both Saints & Angels in heaven hear our prayers. He ſaith 4. *We give Saints too high titles. Bellarmine* anſwers *lib. Citato cap.* 17. *§ Eſt tamen Notandum*, and ſaith, *we call not one them as gods, nor honour any above their merits* He argues 4. afterward, *Every Nation hath a particular guardian Saint. Anſw.* And is this ſuch a treſpaſs? I ſay no more; *But S. George for England.* Yet ſee, if you pleaſe *Bellarmine, cap.* 20. *Citato. §. argumentum octavum.* he laſtly argues out of Scripture (in the end of this Section.) *Rom.* 10. 14. *Bellarmine* directly anſwers the place, *cap.* 22. *Citato initio. §. primum argumentum.* And is it not pitiful to hear ſuch ſtale arguments as theſe, thought doughty enough, by a Doctor, to defeat Popery. God help him. Now to ſome other Cavils he hath in this 9th Section.

Page 126 he ſlights the practice of common people, who have recourſe to Saints for their temporal goods; make their addreſſes to them for health, ſeek their Patronage, &c. *Anſw.* It was doubtleſs ſome good congruous thought that withheld our Doctor from ſlighting alſo that poor *Taylor* of *Hippo*, by name *Florentius*, who having loſt his Cloak, had not wherewithall to buy an other: What did he? *Adviginti Martyres*, &c. he prayed *before* the twenty *Martyrs*, and begged with a loud voice that he might be

be clothed, ſome young men heard him, and ſcorned the good *Taylor*, (as our Doctor doth here vulgar people) yet his prayer proved ſucceſſful, heard he was, and his want miraculouſly ſupplied. This you may read in S. *Auſtin lib.* 22. *de civit. Dei. cap.* 8. *circa medium.*

Whence I argue, if this poor man, by addreſſing himſelf to deceaſed *Martyrs* for a cloak prayed wel, and laudably, yes, and by ſuch prayers got what he aſked; moſt blameleſs certainly are the common people, while they petition any Saint in Heaven for their temporal goods, (whether ſheep, or oxen it imports not) or, if the Doctor jeer'd at theſe mens devotion, he may, if he like it alſo play the boy, and laugh at the *Taylor*, S. *Auſtin* did not ſo. And,

Here, without much digreſſing, reflect I beſeech you on that witty margent note Mr. *Whitby* hath in his book againſt *S C.* pag. 292. where, to diſcredit this known miracle, he ſpeaks thus. *Farther let it be conſidered that here we have no better preſident then a Taylor, and he ſo ſimple, as to bargain with the Martyrs, how many half-pence he would have to buy his cloak.* Subtilelyobſerved, for firſt there is not a word in S. *Auſtin* of the poor mans bargaining with the Martyrs, unleſs his earneſt prayer be called a bargain. Secondly Mr. *Whitby* ſaith *in his context* that the *Taylor* prayed not to the *Martyrs*, but to God at the tomb of the *Martyrs*, if therefore he bargained with any, it was with God for ſo many halfpence. Thirdly he ſlights this miracle upon the account of the *Taylors* ſimplicity, as if, (forſooth) God could do wonders on none but the Learned, or Doctors of Divinity. Fourthly and chiefly, he is pit-

tifully out every way, for no one takes this miracle upon the *Taylors* credit, but upon S. *Auſtins*, who recounts it as a wonder done in behalf of this poor man, and ſo we credit what he adds of the *Cook* that opening the fiſh, found a gold ring in it, and pitty ing the diſtreſſed Suppliant gave it him with, *ecce quomodo viginti Martyres te veſtiverunt : See how the twenty Martyrs have clothed thee.* And thus much of good peoples devotion to Saints for temporals. Now if you further inquire, not only after the recourſe made by devout Chriſtians to the bleſſed in Heaven for health, and cure of Infirmities, but alſo after the happy ſucceſs they have had by their prayer, volumes would not ſuffice to recount particulars. The moſt I'le do here is to remit any that doubts, (if judicious and prudent) to S. *Auſtin* in the place now cited, where he tells us, next after thoſe words *ad Aquas Fibilitanas*, not of one, but many miraculouſly cured at the relicks of S. *Stephen.* There a blind woman received her ſight. There *Eucharius* a Prieſt of *Spain* tormented with the ſtone, was freed of his miſery, and the ſelf ſame man caſt down by an other infirmity, lay ſo dead, *ut ei jam pollices ligarentur*, but was raiſed up miraculouſly ; and this ſaith S. *Auſtin* was done *epitulatione memorati Martyris by the help and aſſiſtance of S. Stephen.*

See *Bellar.* cap. 20. *Supra.* § *Argumentum nonũ.*

Learn therefore, (and 'tis the main drift of S. *Auſtin*,) that Saints hear our prayers, pray for us, yes, and obtain by their interceſſion many a large bleſſing. So the Saint, in the enſuing ninth Chapter which relates to the miracles mentioned in the precedent ; *pro iſta fide mortui ſunt qui hæc à Domino impetrare*

petrare poſſunt, for this Faith the Martyrs dyed, who can get ſuch favours of our Lord. Again, a few lines after, *quare Martyres tanta poſſunt qui pro ea fide,* &c. wherefore *Martyrs can doe theſe great matters, who were ſlain for that Faith which preaches Chriſts holy reſurrection.* Finally, he ends thus, *ſive enim Deus ipſe per ſe ipſum,* &c. *whether God by himſelf work after a ſtrange manner, or do theſe wonders by his Miniſters, or ſome of them by the Spirits of Martyrs, eis orantibus tantum & impetrantibus, non etiam operantibus, they onely praying for us, and impetrating, but not* effecting, *or* working *theſe wonders immediatly, cannot be comprehended of mortalls.* Thus S. *Auſtin,* who undoubtedly here affirms that theſe bleſſed Spirits pray, and obtain'd by their prayers, *orantibus, & impetrantibus* (mark the words) both health of body and greater benefits.

Mr. *Whitby* page 292. cited above, ſeems to make little account of S. *Auſtins* eighth Chapter now mentioned, becauſe of ſome corruptions (ſo he ſpeaks) noted by *Ludovicus Vives.* And what are theſe? I *Anſwer*; two or three differences in words only, variouſly read in other copies, as for, *Epiſcopo projecto,* other copies have, *Epiſcopo afferente projecto,* &c. greater exceptions *Ludovicus Vives* hath not againſt this eighth Chapter; nor queſtions at all the ſubſtance of one miracle there related by S. *Auſtin.* No, theſe ſtand as they are told (and ſo doth the ninth Chapter entirely) unexcepted againſt by *Ludovicus,* or any body elſe & do ſo powerfully prove, that the Saints in Heaven pray for us, and afford us aſſiſtance that none ſhall ever anſwer them with probability; It were but loſt time (becauſe they are vulgarly known) to add to

theſe

theſe ancient miracles, others of undoubted credit, wrought by the interceſſion of Saints in later ages, and very univerſally. There is not a Kingdome or Country where Catholick Religion floriſhes, which will not evidence theſe wonders. And *England* alſo anciently hath had this glory, but now a new Faith hath outed all old miracles. Bleſſed be Almighty God, not onely our age we live in, is renowned for miraculous cures done upon the infirm and diſeaſed, by earneſt prayer made to the ever immaculate Virgin, mother of God; but, this very year alſo (and the laſt now over) affords us moſt undoubted ones wrought in *Antwerp* and *Mecklin* by the interceſſion of the ever glorious Saint *Xaverius* a Saint our Doctor pag, 133. would caſt out of Heaven. (For the firſt, ſee *Juſtus Lipſius* (an erudite, and learned writer) in his third Tome towards the end printed at *Antwerp anno* 1637. *page* 687. *intituled* thus, *Diva Virgo Hallenſis*; and page 721. with this title. *Diva Sichemienſis, ſive Aspricollis.*

For the Second, to wit, for ſtrange cures done on the diſeaſed by the great Apoſtle of the *Indies* S. *Xaverius*, they are here moſt manifeſtly laid open to the eyes of all, ſick patients own them, ſworn witneſſes teſtify them, expert Doctors of Phyſick, (after long trial to cure them) acknowledge the cures to be miraculous; Biſhops after a moſt rigid examination, have approved them, none can doubt of them, but ſuch as either incline to a ſpirit of Atheiſm, or vainly endeavour to make null the beſt proof of our Faith, to extinguiſh the cleareſt light of Chriſtianity, which Age after Age hath beautified the Church, and gained millions to it, I mean *the glory of miracles*: And this

is

is done by a Doctor to maintain his wordy Religion made up of a few abuſed Scripture phraſes and I know not what other canting language without fruits of Religion, without efficacy of doctrine, without miracles, or finally any one mark of credibility, that may prudently evidence it to be Chriſtian.

Now concerning our Doctors other exception againſt pious good people, who ſeek the patronage of Saints in time of danger or otherwiſe, I'le briefly give you one inſtance taken out of S. *Gregory Nyſſen* a worthy Biſhop, who was preſent at the firſt Council of *Conſtantinople*, and writ the *Symbolum Fidei* there; read him I beſeech you in the Oration he hath *de S^to Theodoro Martyre*, with me, it is in his *ſecond Tome Printed at Paris* 1615. *pag.* 1011. and *pag.* 1017. Becauſe the impious *Scythians* threatned a war to the Country, *Timemus afflictiones* (ſaith S. *Gregory*) *expectamus pericula, non longe abſunt ſceleſtes Scythæ bellũ adverſus nos parturientes: We fear afflictions, we expect danger; the wicked Scythians, are as it were, in labour for a war againſt us.* What doth the Saint? he betakes himſelf thus by earneſt prayer to S. *Theodore* a Soldier; *Intercede, ac deprecare pro patria apud communem Regem, & Dominum: Make interceſſion, and pray for our country to him who is our common King and Lord.* Again; *Ut miles propugna* (*pro nobis*) *ut Martyr pro conſervis utere libertate loquendi: As you are a ſoldier, fight for us and defend us, as a martyr, ſpeak freely for your fellow-ſervants here.* Finally, a few lines after, *Quod ſi majori etiam opus fuerit advocatione*, &c. *And if more prayer be needful, aſſemble together the whole quire of your brethren martyrs and jointly pray for us. Admone Petrum, excita Paulum*

Joannem item, &c. *Put S. Peter in mind, ſtir up S. Paul, and that beloved diſciple of our Lord, S. John, that theſe be ſollicitous for the Churches; they once were chains, paſſed dangers, and finally died.* Thus S. *Gregory*. If therefore this worthy Biſhop ſought protection and patronage of a Soldier Martyr, in danger of war, well may a frail woman in danger of ſinning become a ſuppliant to S. *Mary Magdalen*, which our Doctor likes not of. And for Gods ſake tell me, what miſchief is it to Chriſtianity, (if Saints hear our prayers,) that a Painter have a ſpecial devotion to S. *Luke* ſkilful in that Art, though our Doctor (no man knows why) holds it ſuperſtition. *I ſay if Saints hear our Prayers*, and that they do ſo, this very Petition made by S. *Gregory* to S. *Theodore* is my warrant, neither Doctor *Andrews*, nor *Chamier*, nor *Whitby*, who vainly endeavour to make the Oration ſpurious, (becauſe they know not what elſe to ſay) ſhall utter ſo much as a probability againſt it.

CHAP. XXI.

Of Saints Canoniz'd excepted againſt by the Doctor. Of his untrue quotations. Of his Miſtake concerning the Multitude of Holydayes.

AFter this long digreſſion I return to my taſk impoſed on me, and needs muſt ſay a word of our Doctors quotations. I find in his pag. 132. S. *Auſtin* cited for

for this excellent truth; *Tutius, & incundius loquar ad meum Jesum quam ad aliquem Sanctorum Spiritum Dei: I'le speak more safely and more chearfully to my Lord Jesus, then to any of the Saints or Spirits of God.* And 'tis worthily spoken, but where find we this? The Doctor points us to S. *Austin, Visitatione Minorum Sept. S. Aug.* what this *Sept. S. Aug.* signifies no man knows, and less know I where to find *Visitat Minorum.* Perhaps it is an error of the Printer. However these words are in S. *Austin's* 9th *Tome lib* 2. *de Visitatione Infirmorum,* (not *Minorum*) *cap.* 2. which no way exclude praying to Saints, but manifestly suppose it. *Tutius,* & *Incundius* clear all, and render this Sence, *'Tis good and safe to pray to Saints, but our Lord Jesus is eminently above them, and therefore more safely and chearfully we pray to Jesus.*

Page 133. he cites Cardinal *Bessarion apud Bodin,* undervaluing certain Saints; and our Doctor gives you a list of them thus, *S. Fingar, S. Anthony of Padua, S. Christopher, Charles Borromeus, Ignatius Loyola, Xaverius,* then deceitfully adds, and *many others,* of whom, saith the Doctor, *Bessarion* complained, *that many of them were such persons whose life he could not approve,* &c. observe here first, the Context of our Doctor, and how he cheats his Reader, whom he would have believe, that beside *many others, Bessarion* reproved the life of *S. Fingar, S. Anthony of Padua, S. Charles Borromeus, S. Ignatius Loyola,* and *S. Xaverius,* yet these three last blessed men were not in the world when *Bessarion* lived; for he quitted this mortal life *Anno Domini* 1472. 2. I affirm that our Doctor shall never shew out of *Bessarion,* that he unsaints any approved for Sanctity by the *Roman* Catholick

Church. S. *Fingar* (though ſome ſay) S. *Anſelm* accounted him a bleſſed man was never yet canonized; and I wonder what our Doctor hath againſt S. *Chriſtopher* of whom little is known. Certainly, (for I have run ſleightly over ſome works of *Beſſarion*) this Grecian Biſhop and Cardinal, employed in ſo many Embaſſies as we read of, troubled not himſelf to cavil either with S. *Chriſtopher*, or S. *Anthony of Padua*. 3. Our Doctor deals not wel with his Reader, for he ſhould for *Beſſarions* aſſertion have remitted him to the Cardinals own book, and not to *Bodinus*. or *Iohn Pudding*, a man of Atheiſtical Principles, whoſe authority with the judicious is altogether as little as the Doctor's. *Bodinus* his *Republick* I have, but yet cannot get a ſight of his *Method. Hiſtorica* to which the Doctor remits me.

Next he cites *Auguſtinus Triumphus de Ancona* affirming, *that all, who are canonized by the Pope, cannot be ſaid to be in Heaven.* And where find we this aſſertion of *Triumphus*? in two places, anſwers our Doctor, viz. *quæſt.* 14. *ad quartum*, and *quæſt.* 17. *ad quartum.* Obſerve here the Doctors ignorance; For, (to ſay nothing of his unſkilfull omitting the Article) theſe two quotations *ad quartum* are the Authours Objections, not his reſolution. The reſolution follows, no way aſſerting what the Doctor ſaith, but contrary thus: *That the Pope, in canonizing a Saint by the exterior evidence he hath of his Sanctity, cannot err; Although, ſaith this Authour, neither Pope, nor Church can know certainly, per certitudinem cauſæ, by the certainty of the cauſe, that all canonized poſſeſs beatitude.* He ſaith, *per certitudinem cauſæ*, becauſe God, who only endues a Soul with

with Charity *cauſaliter*, is only conſcious, that it is enriched with this gift. The Pope and Church know not this *cauſaliter*, but by the effects of Charity ſhewed to the world: Therefore ſaith *Anconitanus quæſt.* 14. *cit. art.* 4. *Ad prim. dicendum, quod licet Papa non poſſit ſcire, per certitudinem cauſæ*, &c. *we ſay although the Pope cannot know, by the certitude of the cauſe, that a Saint whom he canonizeth had Charity, yet he knows it by effects, to wit, by works famous and ſpoken of him; quia probatio charitatis, exhibitio eſt operis; the proofs of Charity, are good works, and this is enough whereby he may judge*, &c. Thus *Anconitanus.*

To what the Doctor adds of ſome reputed Saints for a time, and afterwards burnt for Hereticks. I *Anſwer.* The Objection is frivolous, for no one canonized, or, univerſally honoured as a Saint by the Catholick Church was ever thus dealt with. Though no wonder it is, that a meer cheat gain for a time an opinion of Sanctity with men over credulous, and afterward have his vizard pulled off, and Hypocriſy diſcloſed.

The Doctor ends his ninth Section pag. 134. with a pittifull complaint againſt the multitude of Holydayes in the Church of *Rome*, and ſaith out of *Gavantus*, *that there are about two hundred Holy dayes in the whole year, which is an intolerable burthen to the poor labourer, that on the reſt he can ſcarce earn his bread, beſides much ſuperſtition and licentiouſneſs that follows ſuch diſorderly feſtivities. Anſw.* The ignorance of our Doctor is more then intolerable, who neither underſtands *Gavantus*, nor the practice of our Church. Strange it is, that he alſo complained not of two hun-

dred faſting dayes anſwerable to theſe holydayes, much weakning the labouring man, and conſequently, that the year hath more faſts and feaſts in it, then dayes: This later is as true, as what the Doctor tells us of two hundred holydayes. Let him therefore know, that all theſe holydayes which *Gavantus* calls feaſts, or are placed in the Calender *in red letters*, are not dayes of precept, obliging poor labourers to deſiſt from ſervile work, but are ſtyled feaſts upon this account, that the Church keeps a memory of ſo many bleſſed Saints in order with Office, and Maſs. More then the moſt of them hinder no manual work, nor lay any obligation on the labouring man. Hence his argument of eaſe and licentiouſneſs accompanying theſe feſtivities is made null. Only thus much it proves, that one may innocently ſmile at the Doctors ſkill in what he writes againſt.

CHAP. XXII.

Adjuration of Devils approv'd by the ancient Church and authority of Fathers. The Doctor cannot except againſt our Catholick Exorciſms.

NOw to the Doctors 10. Section, *pag.* 135. where (God bleſs us) he is reſolved to be Tragical, and paſſionately to act againſt all Exorciſms, and conjuring of Devils. For anſwer; Ile give him theſe few Conſiderations, which perhaps may *conjure* him to ſilence hereafter, on this Subject. And

And firſt, it is an eternal ſhame for a Doctor of Divinity to rayl with open mouth againſt all Exorciſm's, ſeeing we are aſcertain'd, that not only Chriſt our Lord impowered his own Diſciples to caſt out Devils, but the Ancient Church likewiſe poſſitively preſcribed a Form of Exorciſm. This we have in the 4th. Council of *Carthage*, celebrated in the year, 398. (and approved by *Leo* the third) *cap.* 7. *Exorciſta* (ſaith the Council) *cum ordinatur, accipiat de manu Epiſcopi libellum in quo Scripti ſunt Exorciſmi, dicente ſibi Epiſcopo: Accipe, & commenda memoriæ, & habeto poteſtatem imponendi manus ſuper energumenum, ſive baptizatum, ſive Catechumenum. Let the Exorciſt when he is ordained, take a book from the hand of the Biſhop, wherein the Exorciſms are writ; the Biſhop ſaying, take this Book, and commit it to memory, and receive power to lay thy hands upon the poſſeſſed perſon, whether Baptized or Catechumen.* Thus ſaid the Ancient Church, even when our Proteſtants ſay it was without error; yet now up ſtarts a new faſhioned Doctor in a corner of the world brim full of anger, and muſt needs vent it againſt theſe ſacred rites: Exorciſms, (forſooth) with him, are *horible impiety*, a *Conjugation of evils*, *Incantations*, *Diabolical charms*, and what not? Well, for adjuring of Devils, and caſting them out of poſſeſſed perſons, we have both the Practice, and Authority of the moſt Ancient Fathers that ever lived in the Church. I'le give you a few, and, for others, remit you to *Pamelius* his notes upon *Tertullian de Baptiſmo*, *pag.* (with me) 468. printed at *Antwerp*, *Anno* 1584. *dæmones* (ſaith *Tertullian in his Apologet*, *adv. Gent. cap.* 31. *pag.* 74.) *id eſt, genios adjurare conſuevimus ut illos*

ab

ab hominibus exigamus. *Devils or Genii we haue a cuſtome to adjure that we may drive them from men.* Again, *cap.* 37. *pag.* 78. *Quis autem vos ab illis,* &c. *who is there that will free you from the incurſions of Devils, which we without reward drive away.* And, *in his Book de Præſcip. cap.* 41. *p.*400. He blames certain women for uſing Exorciſms. Add to *Tertullian* a Father yet more ancient, *Juſtinus Martyr,* in his works printed at *Paris, an.* 1615. *Apologia prima pro Chriſtianis, pag.* 45. *Complures,* ſaith the Saint, *dæmonum intemperijs correptos per orbem omnem, & hanc veſtram vrbem,* &c. *You have many ſeized on by Devils the whole world over, yes, and in this your City, which your* Conjurers *and* Witches *could not help; and not a few of our men, Per nomen Jeſu Chriſti ſub Pontio Pilato Crucifixi adiurantes ſanarunt,* &c. *Have by adjuring them in the Name of Chriſt Jeſus Crucified, cured them, have diſarmed theſe Devils, and caſt them out of thoſe poſſeſſed men.* The like we read in S. *Juſtins Dialogue cum Tryphone Judæo,* (with me in the ſame edition pag. 147. (*& hodie quoque illi per nomen Jeſu Chriſti adjurati nobis parent,* &c. *and at this day, thoſe infernall Spirits, adjured by the name of Jeſus Chriſt, with fear and trembling obey us.* Read alſo S. *Cyprian* printed at *Paris ann.* 1648. *ad Demetrianum* pag. 236. *O, ſi audire eos velles* (ſaith the St.) *& videre quando à nobis adjurantur, & torquentur ſpiritualibus flagris, & verborum tormentis de obſeſſis corporibus ejiciuntur, quando ejulantes, & gementes voce humana, & poteſtate divina, flagella, & verbera ſentientes, venturum judicium confitentur. O Demetrian, if thou wouldſt hear, and ſee when thoſe evil Spirits are conjured by*

us, and vexed by our ſpiritual ſcourges, and the torment of thoſe words we ſpeak, being caſt out of poſſeſſed bodys, if thou didſt but hear and ſee, when howling, and ſighing like men, they feel our ſtripes and laſhes, and confeſs a day of judgement to come &c. Veni, & cognoſce, come and know theſe wonders to be true, which we here relate. Thus S. *Cyprian.* Here are adjurations, here are ſpiritual ſcourges, here are ſacred words, here are Devils caſt out of poſſeſſed bodys (howling and crying) by the power of God at theſe adjurations, and ſpeaking of words. Let the Doctor ſpeak out, and tell us plainly if he dares with any conſcience ſay that all this is nothing but *Diabolical charming, and horrible impiety.*

Would he pleaſe to credit me, I might tell him a true ſtory of a certain man who had his houſe miſerably haunted with evil Spirits; much affliction they gave both to his Servants and Cattle. To be ſhort he called for a Prieſt, and begged him to pray in his houſe, who did ſo; he ſaid Maſs, offered up the Sacrifice of Chriſts ſacred body, and prayed very earneſtly that that trouble might ceaſe. His prayer prevailed, ceaſe it did. Yet more; This good man had from a friend ſome of that holy earth which was brought from *Hieruſalem*, where our Lord *Jeſus* was buried, and this he hung up in his chamber to ſecure himſelf from danger of theſe evil Spirits. This is the ſtory; and will the Doctor believe it on my word? No, he laughs at it; it ſmells faith he, of Superſtition; that offering up of Chriſts body ſacrificed, and keeping that earth ſhould free the mans chamber from Devils, is plain Popery ſavouring too much of an unbloody Sacrifice, and the doctrin of relicks,&c. I

grant all (except the Superſtition) and tell the Doctor, he muſt either credit the ſtory, or diſcredit S. *Auſtin* who relates it in his 22. book *de civitate* (*Antwerp* print anno 1676. cap 8. page 297. The mans name was *Heſperius* (*vir tribunitius*) *a chief commander*. More particulars you have in the place now cited worth reading: if any yet deſire more of the force of prayer, and Exorciſms againſt Devils, let him read that ancient authour *Optatus Milevit. lib.* 4 *adverſus Parmenianum* pag. 79. *Paris* print, with *Albaſpins* notes 1631 *Hoc exorciſmus operatur per quem ſpiritus immundus depellitur, & in loca deſerta fugatur. Exorciſms drive away Devils, and baniſh them into deſert places.* Thus *Optatus*. And S. *Gregory* the great tells you of ſtrange wonders done upon poſſeſſed perſons by B. *Fortunatus* Biſhop, in his firſt book of *Dialog.* cap. 9. pag. 952. *Paris* print 1571.

Theſe truths ſuppoſed (which no Proteſtant can anſwer) I will with licenſe inquire of our Doctor what it is he finds fault with in our Catholick Exorciſms againſt Devils? Is it the power we have from Chriſt *Jeſus* to caſt them out of perſons poſſeſſed, or places haunted by them? The very authority of Fathers already alledged, and the continued favour of Almighty God to this our age, in aſſiſting many (within the bounds of the Catholick Church) to diſpoſſeſs innumerable poſſeſſed, proves the power, and evidenceth moſt undeniably the effects of it. Known Hiſtory for thoſe wonders done in later ages, and yet living ey-witneſſes in our dayes, gain credit with prudent men, and juſtly may conquer a greater increduty then the Doctor harbours in his breaſt. All cannot be fiction nor the Authors proved lyars that writ ſuch ſtories, yet more.

Doth

Doth our Doctor reprehend the words we uſe in Exorciſms? Yes. And why? Is it becauſe they are adjurative? If ſo, the Fathers now cited are our warrant, and will ſilence the Doctor. Is it becauſe they are words unuſual, and not eaſily underſtood by all? If this offend him, I anſwer firſt; that there are more unuſual pedantick words in one Dr *Pierces* Sermon then in all the approved Exorciſms of the Catholick Church; yet that Sermon is for the people, theſe Exorciſms are againſt the Devil, who better underſtands the hardeſt terme in them, then the generality of men that Sermon. I anſwer 2. that in the *Roman ritual*, (which we chiefly defend) not one word can be thought unuſual; it is plain Latin all a long, intelligible to the pooreſt Schollar. The like I ſay of that *Manual of Exorciſms* printed at *Antwerp anno* 1626. which our Doctor cauſeleſly cavils at pag. 136. the like of the *Exorciſms* for *the Dioces of Iper, printed at S. Omers anno* 1606.

Beſides theſe I have by me two other Exorciſms, the one printed at *Venice* 1579. the other anno 1585. in an old Character. The book is called *Sacerdotale Romanum*; towards the end of theſe Editions you have the Exorciſm, and both Hebrew and Greek thus in Latin Letters. *Adjuro vos per nomina omnipotentis Dei, Meſſias, Sother, Emanuel, Sabaoth, Adonias*, I adjure you by the names, &c. And this perhaps made our Doctor pag. 138. exclaim againſt ſome Exorciſms for their *falſe Hebrew and baſe Greek*. Sure the good man thought that *Meſſias* and *Sother* ſhould have been a genitive caſe becauſe of *Omnipotentis Dei*, whereas they relate to the precedent words *per nomina*; as if one ſhould ſay *per nomen Jeremias adjuro, by your*

name Jeremy, I adjure you, never to cavil without cauſe. Like cavils about Letters, and writing *Meſſias* without the Hebrew twang, *Sather* leſs correctedly, &c. I omit; and tell the Doctor that a poor Pariſh Prieſt ſhall do more againſt the Devil with this he calls *falſe Hebrew, and baſe Greek*, then twenty Miniſters in *England* with the moſt quaint extemporal prayers they can make.

What elſe remains reprehenſible in theſe exorciſms? The Doctor anſwers pag. 141. *Superſtition* (a monſtrous evil doubtleſs; Wel. I'le deale plainly and licenſe the Doctor to make uſe of any definition, which, either ancient Father, or new approved writers give us of Superſtition (we will ſtand to his choice) yet I'le aſſure him he ſhall never ſo much as touch Catholicks with the leaſt likelihood of Superſtition in their exorciſms. What *Lactantius* ſaith of Superſtition *lib. 4. de inſt. cap. 28. initio: qui Deos precabantur, & immolabant ut ſui ſibi filij ſuperſtites eſſent, ſuperſtitioſi ſunt appellati*, concerns not exorciſms at all, and leſs doth that known one of *Cicero lib. 2. de natura Deorum, qui pro ſuperſtiti prole nimij erant in Dijs precandis*, &c. touch them; if the Doctor therefore pleaſe, we will ſay, that Superſtition is, *Cultus indebitus, ſeu vana religio. A wrong, vain, and incongruous worſhip, which look's like religion, but is not.* And next let us read any approved exorciſm. The prayers made there to Almighty God are Acts of Religion, and neither wrong, nor incongruous worſhip. The calling on God by ſeveral names we find in Scripture, cannot be judged by a Chriſtian, vain or incongruous. The reading of *Davids Pſalms*, and the Goſpels of *Jeſus* Chriſt is not in vain.

The

The adjuring of *Devils* is warranted by Fathers, and the power of caſting them out is given by *Jeſus* Chriſt. Where then lyes the danger of vain worſhip, or ſo much as the leaſt ſigne of any Superſtition? If the word *exorciſm* diſpleaſe our Doctor, we have it, (to ſay nothing of others) in S. *Auſtin lib.* 1. *de peccatorum meritis, & remiſſione cap.* 34. *initio and lib.* 6. *contra Julianum cap* 5. with an exſufflation added in Baptiſm. *Filios fidelium* (ſaith the S.) *nec exorcizaret, nec exſufflaret,* &c. *The Church would neither exorciſe, nor breath on little Children, were it not to free them from the power of darkneſs, and Prince of death.* Let the Doctor ſay what he thinks of this *exſufflation*; if ſuch a Ceremony be not Superſtition, none in our exorciſms can be; if the ſign of the Croſs frights him, he may know, 'tis allowed by all Antiquity, and Bleſſed S. *Auſtin* thus *Tom.* 4. *lib. uno de catech. rudibus cap.* 20. a little after the beginning. *Crucis ſigno in fronte hodie tanquam in poſte ſignandus es, omnesque Chriſtiani ſignantur, Little ones and all Chriſtians are ſigned with the ſigne of the Croſs.* And what, beſides the things now mentioned, can be blamable in our approved exorciſms? I ſay *approved*; for, if any other, either is, or hath been extant, juſtly reprehenſible, we defend it not. The anathematizing the Devil by the name of *Beelzebub, Satan,* (or any other we have in Scripture) is no more Superſtition then to call an open Rebel, *Traitor*: neither can the caſting of his picture into the fire, (if any exorciſt does it) be thought an action more ſuperſtitious then to hang a Traitor up in *effigie*, when his perſon is out of reach; hanging is for the one, burning is for the other. I ſay, if any *exorciſm* allows this, for the *Ro-*

man Ritual, we chiefly ſtand to, mentioneth no ſuch burning.

CHAP. XXIII.

Objections againſt Exorciſms ſolved. Of the Doctors miſtaken quotations.

NOw a word to two Objections of our Doctor, *if theſe things* (ſaith he p. 142. (meaning Exorciſms) *come from God, let them ſhew their warrants.* Anſw. We have ſhewed already. The power given by Chriſt our Lord to his Church for the caſting out of Devils is our warrant. The definitions of Councils, preſcribing a form of Exorciſm, how to caſt them out, are our warrant. The Authority of the Graveſt Fathers that ever lived, approving the conjuration of Devils, is our warrant. Their diſtinguiſhing between the enchantments of Heathens, Incantations, Witchery, and theſe pious Exorciſms, is our warrant. The practice of the Church, and uſe of theſe conjurations in all Ages, is our warrant. The wonders God hath done by Exorciſms, (both ancient and modern Authours relate them) are our warrant. Moſt aſſured, and certain experience in theſe our dayes, that Devils are caſt out of poſſeſſed perſons, is our warrant. What then remaines but that we retort the Argument, and tell our Doctor, if after ſo many convincing, manifeſt, and undeniable proofs, (that theſe Exorciſms

Exorciſms come from God) He unworthily decrys them, let him ſhew his warrant, and anſwer my arguments. But this he ſhall never do while by opening only one *Cyprian*, or a *Juſtin Martyr* (to ſay nothing of others) I can *conjure* him to ſilence.

In the interim, I would know of our Doctor whether he thinks there are, or have been in this our age, perſons poſſeſſed of Devils? If he ſays no, moſt manifeſt experience (of Devils ſpeaking in an unknown tongue, of their violent torturing a body, and moving it above all force of nature, &c,) prove the contrary. Again, Anciently there were theſe *Energumeni*, and very numerous. And why not now? are any Devils dead ſince that time? or leſs malitious now then anciently? are men in theſe dayes better ſecured from them then the primitive Chriſtians? *Toyes.* Nothing is probable. Therefore the Doctor muſt confeſs, if, he'l deal ingeniouſly, that there are ſometimes theſe *Energumeni*. All cannot be fiction that authors write of poſſeſſed perſons, and if ſome onely be true, moſt deplorable is the condition of ſuch as are truly poſſeſſed; who, deſtitute of comfort (if old Papiſts help not) may ſigh, and groan under their miſery: relief they can have none from Dr. *Taylor* (who oppoſes all Exorciſms) and as little from his fellow Miniſters in *England*, for few among them that ever yet I heard of who either dare encounter a Devil in a poſſeſſed body, or if they doe it, they ſhew themſelves unlucky Exorciſts, for they never give poor ſufferers any eaſe.

The other Objection that our Doctor hath (*pag.* 141.) is taken out of *Origen. Tract.* 35. *in Matth.* and 'tis the onely thing in ſubſtance I find in this tenth Section,

Section, though I will assure the Reader (having perused three Editions of *Origen.*) that the Doctor both omits in the words he gives you, what Origen hath; and afterward, conceals what may serve for an Explication, if *Origen*, deserve it, for some say he erred in this place; so *Baronius ad annum Christi*, 56. *n.* 4. in the *Antwerp* print 1612. others with *Bellarmin* incline to think that these Treatises on S. *Matth.* (as the 5th. is not) are not *Origens*, *viz.* *Bellar. de Scriptorib. Eccles.* However I'le give you *Origens* own words (in the *Basil print*, *anno* 1571.) *pag.* 187. uttered on this occasion, that the Prince of the *Jews* adjured our Saviour, whereupon he makes a Digression thus. *Quæret aliquis si convenit vel dæmones adjurare? Some* (saith he) *may ask whether it be meet to adjure Devils?* Then adds, *Et qui respicit ad multos qui talia fecere ausi sint, dicet, non sine ratione fieri. And he who looks on the practice of many that dare to do so, will say, 'tis done not without reason* (these words our Doctor omits totally) *Origen.* goes on (and here is the onely difficulty) *qui autem aspicit Jesum imperantem dæmonibus*, &c. *But he that beholds Jesus commanding Devils, and giving power to his Disciples over them, and to heal diseases, will say; that to adjure Devils, is not according to the power given by our Saviour. Judaicum est enim. For its Judaical.* Thus *Origen*; And here ends our Doctor, concealing what follows immediately thus. *Hoc, & si aliquando a nostris tale aliquid fiat, simile sit ei, quod a Solomone Scriptis adjurationibus, solent dæmones adjurari*, &c. *This* (Judaical adjuration) *if sometime any such thing be done by our men, is like that, which Devils are wont to be adjured with, out of certain*

tain written adjurations of Solomon. *Sed & ipſi qui utuntur adjurationibus illis aliquoties nec idoneis conſtitutis libris utuntur. But even they who uſe theſe adjurations at ſome time uſe not right Books. Quibusdam autem & de Hebræo acceptis adjurant dæmonia: Taking certain things out of the Hebrew they adjure Devils.* Hitherto you have faithfully *Origens* words, and his whole Context in order; which in rigor (all circumſtances well weighed) only condemn Judaical conjurations, or ſuch Books (not allowable) vitiated perhaps with Jewiſh Exorciſms. For moſt certain it is that the *Jews* had their Exorciſts; and that their power of caſting out Devils ceaſed at the beginning of Chriſtian Religion, or ſoon after: read *Acts* the 19. *v.* 13. Certain it is alſo, if we believe *Joſephus* the *Jew*, *lib.* 8. *de antiquitate*, *cap.* 2. (with me, *folio* 68. *verſus finem*) that *Solomon* had his Exorciſms compoſed, as ſome moſt Learned are of Opinion, after his fall into Idolatry. Theſe and ſuch like adjurations *Origen* reproves, and not any Chriſtian Catholick Exorciſm.

My reaſon is, firſt, that *Origen* contradicted not Fathers more ancient then himſelf; ſuch were *Juſtinus Martyr*, and *Tertullian* above cited; theſe adjured Devils, therefore *Origen* might do ſo. 2. *Lib.* 1. *contra Celſum* with me (in the Edition above named) *pag.* 637. He profeſſedly acknowledgeth the power of caſting out Devils given to Chriſtians; yes, and after he had taxed *Celſus* of injuſtice, and open calumny, for aſcribing their ejection done by Chriſtians, to Incantations and Sorcery. He anſwers thus; *n.* 6. *Non enim incantationibus pollere videntur, ſed nomine Jeſu, cum commemoratione ejus factorum;*

 nam,

nam, his verbis ſæpenumero profligati ſunt dæmones ex hominibus. That is, *Chriſtians do nothing in this matter by any Charms, or Enchantments, but prevail againſt Devils by naming Chriſt Jeſus, and commemorating his glorious works. Thus these wicked ſpirits are driven out of poſſeſſed perſons*; And truly the like we do yet in our Catholick adjurations. 3. It is madneſs to think, that one ſo well verſed in Scripture, as *Origen* was, had ſuch a horror of this word *Adjuro*, that he judged it unſeemly in the mouth of a Chriſtian; for the Apoſtle himſelf uſeth it, writing to the *Theſſ. Epiſt.* 1. *cap.* 5. *v.* 27. *Adjuro vos per dominum ut legatur Epiſtola hæc.* I *adjure ye by our Lord*, &c. And mark, it is a word of command, ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν κύριον. Yes, and the ſame that the Devil uſed againſt our Saviour, *Mar.* 5. *v.* 7. *Adjuro te per Deum*, ὁρκίζω σὲ τὸν θεὸν, &c. *I adjure thee by Almighty God.* Briefly therefore diſtinguiſh a double adjuration, the one of no Efficacy, becauſe either vain or *Judaical*; and this *Origen* rejecteth; The other is Chriſtian uſed in our Catholick Exorciſms, with the ſacred Name of Jeſus; and this he approves. The Doctor may object that *Origen*, ſpeaking of the High Prieſt adjuring our Saviour, makes this Argument; *Si enim jurare non licet, quia nec alterum adjurare licet. If it be not lawful to ſwear, neither lawful is it to adjure another.* I anſwer; This confirms all we have ſaid hitherto in *Origens* defence. For, as none can judge that ſo great a Doctor as *Origen*, condemned all ſwearing, which God allowes in Scripture: [*Vivit Dominus. Jurabit Dominus. Per nomen ejus jurabis*, &c.] but only ſuch as is irreligious and profane. So none can infer upon this proof, that he thought all

all adjuration illicit; though he profeſſedly oppoſed irreligious and Judaical Exorciſms. Thus much in behalf of *Origen*, if theſe Treatiſes on S. *Mat.* be his; for *Eraſmus* in the preface to them, ſaith, *Neque enim Hieronimus agnoſcit hoc opus.* *S. Hierom acknowledgeth them not.*

The Doctor, *pag.* 142. having done with *Origen*, quotes S. *Chriſoſtom* for this *ſober ſaying*, *we poor wretches cannot drive away flies, much leſs Devils.* And remits you to the Saint, *in illa verba qui credit in me majora faciet.* I anſwer, that S. *Chriſoſtom* may perhaps have theſe words, *qui credit in me*, &c. 40. times over in his Large and Voluminous writings; Muſt I therefore run over all theſe Tomes, to meet with this *ſober ſaying*; for moſt certainly it is not where any Reader would expect to have it, I mean in S. *Chriſoſtoms* 73. *hom. in cap.* 14. *Joan.* there are the words of Scripture, *qui credit in me*, &c. And S. *Chriſoſtoms* large Explication on them; but not ſo much as one ſyllable of either Flie or *Devil*, or any *poor wretch unable to caſt out Devils*, but much to the contrary. *Hoc veſtrum jam eſt*, ſaith the Saint, *miracula operari, ego abeo. It belongs to you* (my Diſciples) *to work miracles, I am now on my departure.* The *Chriſoſtom I cite* is the *Paris* print, *anno* 1588. his Comments on the words *qui credit*, &c. are page 293. and other Editions accord alſo with it, even the Greek by Sir *Henry Savil.*

CHAP. XXIV.

The bleſſing of Water prov'd by Irrefragable Authority. Of Miracles done by Holy Water. No proof againſt it.

THe Doctor, pag. 143. and 11 *Section* thinks with a few empty words, and a like number of inſipid jeers to unhollow ſuch Creatures, as the moſt ancient Fathers of Gods Church have reputed holy, becauſe made ſo with a ſacred benediction. Such are *Holy Water, the Paſchal Candle, Oyl,* and *Holy Bread,* ſlighted by him, without proof at all. Truely I am aſtoniſhed at our Doctor (having at leaſt) read *Bellarmin de cultu ſanct. lib. 3. cap. 7.* and peruſed the Arguments of this Learned Authour, for the bleſſing of *Water, Oyl,* &c. That he neither affords us ſo much as a word of anſwer to the Arguments, nor yet endeavours to gainſay them by one Syllable of Scripture, by any Authority of Councils, of Fathers, or the Antient practice of the Primitive Church.

Bellarmin firſt proves out of Scripture, that creatures are capable of benediction; *Every Creature is good,* ſaith the Apoſtle. 1. *ad Tim.* 4. *Sanctificatur autem per verbum Dei, & orationem: And is ſanctified by the Word of God, and Prayer.* He ſhowes you alſo out of S. *Dennis, Alexander* the firſt, *Optatus,* S. *Cyprian,* S. *Baſil,* and others, that Water anciently was bleſſed in the Church. The like of *Oyl,* by the Authority of S. *Clement, Dennis,* and *Baſil.* The benediction of Bread (beſides the Euchariſt) is taught by

by S. *Austin, Tom. 7. lib. 2. De peccatorum meritis & remissione, cap.* 26. speaking of the Catechumens. *Et quod accipiunt,* (saith the Saint) *quamvis non sit Corpus Christi, Sanctum est tamen, & sanctius quam cibi quibus alimur. And what these Catechumens take, although it be not Christs Body, yet it is holy, yes, and more holy then the meat wherewith we are nourished.* Hence I argue, if Bread can be hallowed, Water may; And this I prove by three irrefragable Arguments.

The first is taken out of the Ancient *Synesius*, Bishop of *Ptolemaijs*, or *Cyrene*, in his book printed at *Paris*, *anno* 1633. (we have it also in *Bibliotheca Patrum*) read these words in that Treatise he intitles *Catastasis*, * with me *pag.* 304. *Ego in loco meo in ecclesia permanebo. Lustralis ante me aquæ sanctissima vasa collocabo,* &c. *Illic ego & sedebo vivus, & mortuus jacebo. Ile remain in my place, that is the Church. Ile place before me the hallowed Vessels of Water, there Ile sit alive, and ly when I am dead.*

* De clade pentapolitanâ Ἐγὼ κατὰ χώραν ἐκκλησίας μενῶ, τὰς πανάγους προστήσομαι χέρνιβας, &c.

Yet more, read his 121. *Epistle to Anastasius, pag.* 258. If, saith *Sinesius*, the Administration of the Common-wealth resides in Bishops; these are the men that must do justice on wickedness. *Quandoquidem publicus gladius, non minus quam lustralis aqua quæ in templorum vestibulis collocatur, civitatis est piaculum. Seeing that the publick Sword no lesse purgeth a City, then Holy Water doth, that is placed in the entry of our Churches.* And thus it is kept in Churches to this day.

The second Testimony we have, is, in the more

ancient *Epiphanius*, *Tom.* 2. *lib.* 1. *contra hæreſes*, *hæreſi* 30. with me *pag.* 61. in the *Baſil* print; where the Saint tells us; that, *Joſephus* the Jew (ſeeing fire, contrary to its own nature, made unactive by Enchantment, and hindred from burning by Witchcraft) called for water (a world of *Jews* being preſent) made the ſigne of the Croſs upon it, put his finger into the Veſſel of the bleſſed Water, ſaying, in the Name of Jeſus of *Nazareth*, whom my Fathers crucified, *Fiat virtus in hac aquâ ad reprobationem omnis incantationis & Magiæ quam hi fecerunt. Let there be vertue in this water, for the diſolving the charms done by theſe men.* Then, ſaith *Epiphanius*, he took ſome of the water in his hand, ſprinkled the ſeveral enchanted Furnaces with it. *Et diſſoluta ſunt incantamenta, the Witchcraft ceaſed, the fire burned, the people who ſaw the wonder, cryed aloud, one God there is, who helps the Chriſtians, and ſo departed.* Add hereunto, if you pleaſe, a like Miracle done by *Joſephus*, upon a poſſeſſed man, and with Holy Water alſo. *Epiphanius* relates it in the precedent *pag.* 60. *Joſeph*, ſaith he, *having ſhut the doors, took water into his hands, bleſſed it with the ſigne of the Croſs, beſprinkled the raging man with it, commanded the Devil in the Name of Jeſus to be gone, and the poſſeſſed party was cured.* This Miracle ſaith *Epiphanius* the *Jews* knew, and great talk there was of it; ſome ſaid, *Joſephus* had opened the *Gazophilacium*, and finding there the *Name of God writ*, did the wonder by force of this Name. *It was true he did the Miracle, but not as the Jews imagined.* Thus *Epiphanius*.

In the laſt place, Ile give you *Theodorets* Teſtimony

ny. *lib.* 5. *Eccleſiaſt. hiſtor. cap.* 21. in the *Colen* print anno 1577. *pag.* 312. where he tells you alſo, *how the Devil hindred fire from burning, though wood, of its own nature combuſtible, was applied to it.* The Charm (to be brief) was told the Paſtor, who forthwith ran to the Church, and commanded a little veſſel of water to be given him; this he put under the holy Altar, falling proſtrat on the ground, earneſtly begged of *Almighty God not longer to ſuffer this Tyranny of the Devil,* &c. prayer ended, he made the ſigne of the Croſs upon the water, gave it to *Equitius* a Deacon, commanding him withall ſpeed, to ſprinkle the enchanted fire with it, which done, ſaith *Theodoret, dæmon aufugit, the Devil ran away, the water burned like Oyl, and the fire conſumed the wood in a moment.* If any deſire more for the bleſſing of water, let him read *Tertull. lib. de baptiſmo cap.* 4. S. *Ambroſ. lib.* 2. *de Sacram. cap.* 5. *and S. Auſtin Tract.* 118. *in Joannem.* For the bleſſing of Oyl, and the *Paſchal* Candle, ſee *Bellarmin* above cited.

Let us now return to our Doctor and make my aſſertion good, *viz.* That he hath not ſo much as a ſyllable of either Scripture, Council, or Father, againſt the bleſſing of Water. He cites pag. 143. S. *Cyril of Jeruſalem Catech.* 4. Saying, *that in the Holy and Divine Myſteries of our Faith, neceſſary it is to do nothing by chance or of our own heads, nor without Scripture*; From whence our Doctor muſt argue thus (if he proves any thing) but to bleſs water is one of the *Divine Myſteries of Faith, and done by chance or of our own heads, without holy Scripture:* Therefore 'tis unwarrantable, and an Invention of man only. To this

diſ-

diſcourſe, I anſwer. That it is neither one of the *Myſteries of Faith*, which S. *Cyril* handles in the place now cited; (for he ſpeaks there only of the equality of the Holy Ghoſt with Father and Son) neither is it *done by chance or of our own heads* (witneſs the Fathers already cited) nor *without Authority of Holy Scripture*, (*Sanctificatur autem per verbum Dei & orationem*, ſaith the *Apoſtle*) nor finally is it againſt S. *Cyril*, who poſſitively to the Doctors confuſion, ſaith that water may be bleſſed, but two leaves only before his own quotation; *Catech.* 3. with me *pag.* 401. (*Bibliot Patrum. Colen. print, Tom.* 4.) his words are. *Nam ut illa quæ in Aris offeruntur, cum natura ſint pura, invocatione dæmonum impura efficiuntur: Sic contra, aqua ſimplex per Spiritus Sancti, Chriſti, & Patris invocationem accepta virtute, ſanctitatem conſequitur. As thoſe things which are offered on Altars,* (he means to Idols) *when pure in their own nature, are made impure by the invocation of Devils: So on the contrary, ſimple Water is made holy, gets a ſanctity by invocating the Holy Ghoſt, Chriſt our Lord, and his Eternal Father.* Had the Doctor ſeen this Teſtimony of S. *Cyril*, he would never have troubled his Reader with the other Quotation, more remote from the purpoſe, then *York* is diſtant from *London*.

Again, our Doctor excepts againſt S. *Gregories* Dialogues, and unworthily ſtiles them *Romantick ſtories*, *pag.* 143. I anſwer; Had a frantick brain brought forth ſuch an expreſſion, none would have wondered; but that a grave Divine ſlights theſe books, highly reverenced, both by the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, cannot be tollerated. In a word, the Doctor ſhall never be able with any ſhadow of proof,

to

to infringe their authority. What therefore that Learned Saint ſaith of Bleſſed *Fortunatus curing a lame man*, &c. is as certainly true, as that the Doctor err's in diſcrediting thoſe Dialogues.

Next the good man is upon us with a jeer: *They throw* (ſaith he pag. 143.) *this Water on ſick Cows horns, on Childrens cradles*, &c. Anſw. And did not the Chriſtian *Italicus* take water alſo from bleſſed *Hilario*, and caſt it on his Enchanted ſtable, on his bewitched Horſes, on his Chariot, on the place or Barriers from whence he uſed to run? Did not the Charm or Witchery ceaſe upon this ſprinkling of water? In ſo much that all cried out. *Marnas victus a Chriſto eſt. Chriſt hath conquered Marnas.* Moſt true it is; no leſſe a Doctor then S. *Hierom* relates the ſtory, *in vita Hilarionis* (Paris print) *pag.* 323. Our Doctor may turn to the page, and if he reverences S. *Hierom*, leave of his jeering.

CHAP. XXV.

Of the Doctors dark Divinity. Of his want of Charity towards his Anceſtors, and all Catholicks.

THe Doctor ends this 11. *Section*, *pag.* 144. with a piece of ſcarce intelligible Divinity. *Upon the Sacraments* (ſaith he) *they are taught to rely with ſo little of Moral, and vertuous Diſpoſitions, that the*

Efficacy of the one is made to leſſen the neceſſity of the other. I anſwer, That every Sacrament (except Infant Baptiſm) requires a vertuous diſpoſition: Penance is of no Efficacy without Contrition, or at leaſt Attrition: The other Sacraments ſtyled *Vivorum*, require *per ſe*, Supernatural inherent Grace, previous to their worthy receiving. How therefore *the Efficacy of one, is made to leſſen the neceſſity of the other*, is Divinity, too dark to be underſtood.

The Doctor goes on. *The Sacraments are taught to be ſo effectual by an inherent Vertue, that they are not ſo much made the Inſtruments of Vertue*, as the *Suppletory*. Anſw. Still we are in a cloud. To get out on't, our Doctor muſt *unriddle* this word *Suppletory*. We ſay thus, and ſpeak plain Language. God, in the operation of Sacraments, is the prime efficient cauſe of Grace; Chriſt, the Meritorious; Sacraments the Inſtrumental. Now, whether they work by an intrinſecal Vertue imprinted (as it were) on them, or are otherwiſe effectual, concerns nothing Catholick Religion. Supernatural inherent Grace we receive by them, when a ſoul is fitly diſpoſed: This is our Doctrine. Yet we have more obſcure Divinity; For he tells us, we teach, that Sacraments are not ſo much *to increaſe Grace, as to make amends for the want of Grace*. God only knows what he means by *this making amends for the want of Grace*: I do not. *Qui poteſt capere capiat*: We ſay (*without this making amends*) that Grace is effectually given in every Sacrament to that ſoul, that comes worthily diſpoſed.

The Doctor in his 12. Section, page 144. talks of Idolatry, but not underſtanding what Idolatry is, nor our Divines Tenets concerning the Wor-

ſhip

ſhip he ſpeaks of, fights againſt ſhadows: I'll only leave him to Mr. *Thorndike* (a great Divine of his own) to learn of him what Idolatry is, and how far the Church of *Rome* is to be charg'd with it; and what the conſequences of ſuch a charge will be. Mr. *Thorndike* in his *juſt Weights and Meaſures*, chap. 1. diſcourſeth it at large: He ſays pag. 2. *If the Pope be Antichriſt, and the Papiſts Idolaters, we need not ſeek farther for the reaſon of the diſtance, we are to own the ſeparation for our own act, and glory in it.* He ſays again, pag. 7. *If it be true*, viz. That the Papiſts be guilty of Idolatry; *we cannot without renouncing our Chriſtianity, hold communion with thoſe whom we charge with it.* So that if this Section of our Doctor which charges us with Idolatry, be true: Mr. *Thorndike* tells him there is no *need of ſeeking farther for the reaſon of the diſtance; This muſt be it*, viz. *That they could not hold communion with Idolaters without renouncing their Chriſtianity*, and therefore they parted; *which ſeparation they own for their own act and glory in it:* Yet Mr. *Thorndike* ſayes, that if this be the beſt reaſon they can give for their ſeparation, they muſt acknowledge themſelves to be the Schiſmaticks: His own words are, Cap. 1. pag. 7. line 14. *For in plain Termes we make our ſelves Schiſmaticks, by grounding our Reformation upon this pretence*; and again in the ſame page line 29. *So that*, ſayes he, *ſhould this Church declare, that the charge which we call Reformation is grounded upon this Suppoſition, I muſt then acknowledge that we are the Schiſmaticks.* Now that *this Pretence*, and *this Suppoſition*, are the ſame which our Doctor in his Section pretends and ſuppoſes us to be guilty of, *viz. Idolatry*, is evident by the

whole Chapter now quoted; and by the Contents of it printed before the Chapter, which end thus; *They that ſeparate from the Church of Rome as Idolaters, are thereby Schiſmaticks before God*: How the Doctor will anſwer this to his own brother, I neither know, nor care; nor can I ſee how he can poſſibly avoid the Imputation of Schiſm in Mr. *Thorndik*'s judgment: for he believes, or elſe he cheats his *Charge*, that we are Idolaters; if he does, he muſt in Mr. *Thorndikes* Opinion, and in all reaſon make that the ground of his Separation; And if he does do ſo, he is *a Schiſmatick before God*, ſayes Mr. *Thorndike*. This may ſerve for anſwer to his charge in general; His particular Inſtances in what we are Idolaters, are; *Worſhipping of Images*, ſayes he, *is a direct breach of the Second Commandment, an act of Idolatry, as much as the Heathens themſelves were guilty of*, &c. Mr. *Thorndike* ſhall anſwer for us again in the Book before cited, Cap. 19. in the Contents whereof, you may read this Propoſition. *Reverencing of Images in Churches is not Idolatry*; In this Chapter, page 126. towards the bottome he has theſe words; *Whether or no having Images in Churches be a breach of the Second Commandment, can be no more queſtion, then whether or no to have any Images be a breach of it; for it muſt forbid Images in Churches, becauſe it forbids all Images*: &c. This and what follows in that chap. clears the having of Images in Churches, from being a breach of the Second Commandment; Now to clear the Reverencing or Worſhipping of them from being Idolatry, read the ſame Chapter on, and page 127. line 31. you ſhall find theſe words; *But to the Images of Saints there can be no Idolatry, ſo long as men*

men take them for Saints; That is Gods creatures. Much leſs to the Images of our Lord; For it is the honour of our Lord, and not of his Image. And again, *line the laſt* of this page, and page 128. *Nay the Council it ſelf* (meaning the 2. of Nice) *though it acknowledge that the Image it ſelf is honoured, by the honour given to that which it ſignifieth, before the Image; yet it diſtinguiſheth this honour from the honour of our Lord: and therefore teacheth not Idolatry, by teaching to honour Images; though it acknowledge that the Image it ſelf is honoured, when it need not.* This is quite contrary to our Doctors Divinity; *The pious Children of the Church of England*, may believe which they pleaſe of theſe two great Divines; the one is a *Biſhop*, but the other ſeems the more wary man; For he makes a cautious propoſal in the 1 Chap. of his Book quoted before, page 2. line 14. *It were good*, ſayes he, *that we did underſtand one another.* And line 30. *Yet it is neceſſary to provide that we contradict not our ſelves.* But our Doctor never caring whom he underſtands, or who underſtands him, thinks it not neceſſary to provide that they contradict not one another, But raſhly ſayes what comes next, right or wrong. What he hath more, pag. 145, 146, 147. relate chiefly, *ad modum colendi*, or to the way of Worſhip; which toucheth nothing on Catholick Religion, or the due reverence given to Images. Divines I know, diſpute this point largely, their different Opinions make no Article of Faith. Let us agree that Images are to be worſhipped in the Senſe of thoſe Fathers we cited above, and in Mr. *Thorndikes* Senſe; And afterward, if the Doctor pleaſe, we'll diſcuſs the Theological Difficulty, how they are to be worſhipped

ſhipped. To what our Doctor has page 148. concerning the Idolatry of worſhipping *Conſecrated Bread and Wine*, Mr. *Thorndike* ſhall once more anſwer for us, who by good luck has the very Inſtance of *the Pagans worſhipping the Sun*, which our Doctor ſayes is all one with our worſhipping *the Conſecrated Bread and Wine*. But Mr. *Thorndike* I dare ſay will not believe him, until he anſwers the beginning of his 19. Chap. quoted before, page 125. the Contents of which at the very beginning have this Propoſition: *The worſhip of the Hoſt in the Papacy is not Idolatry*: If our Doctor will undertake to ſatisfie Mr. *Thorndike*, that he is miſtaken in what he here profeſſes to teach, I preſume he will oblige him highly; For he asks, pag. 5. line 22. of his *Weights and Meaſures*: *Who will take upon him to ſhew us, that the worſhip of the Hoſt in the Papacy is Idolatry?* When theſe two great Doctors are agreed which of them teaches the trueſt Divinity concerning this Point, this Section may, and it may not too, require a farther Anſwer. Till then we'll leave them to diſpute it: 'Tis pitty they ſhould be parted: *Cadmus* his Brood that came into the world an unnatural and extraordinary way, are a proper Embleme of all Hereticks; Their births are monſtrous, and their ends as odd. Angry men that they are, they cannot agree, but without any other help will alwayes (if let alone) deſtroy one another.

Pag. 150. *Sect.* 13. He takes on, to tell thoſe under his Charge, how matters ſtand in point of Religion, and faith; that *we Catholicks dangerouſly err, yes, and injure Faith, ſpoil Hope, ſin againſt Charity: In a word we are men, that bring Ruin to all Religion.* Faith we injure, *by creating new Articles*; To this

we

we have anſwered in the firſt Chapter, that not one new Article is created by us; though the Church, as occaſion is, may more clearly explicate ſome old ones, and hath ever done ſo. *We ſpoil*, ſaith he, *our Hope, by placing it on Creatures. Anſw.* Hope, good Doctor, is a Theological Vertue, and hath God, as he is our final good, for its *formal Object*. The *finis qui* is no Creature; the poſſeſſion of this infinit goodneſs, by a clear Viſion, is; Both theſe, which will make us happy in Heaven, we hope for, and I think, without offence. Which way, the Doctors Hope tends I know not. *We ſin*, ſaith he again, *againſt Charity by damning all that are not of our Opinion. Anſw.* Firſt the Doctor ſins moſt grievouſly againſt Charity by damning all his Anceſtours, (his great great Grand-Father, and ſo upward for a thouſand years) why? they were all old Papiſts, and as he tells us, had *naughty Faith, ſpoiled Hope, great want of Charity, the Salutary doctrine of Repentance torn in pieces*, &c. But none can be ſaved with a Faith, Hope, Charity and Repentance ſpoyled, and worth nothing; Therefore his Anceſtours, (with thouſand thouſands of others) are in a ſad condition, and all damned by his doctrin. I *Anſw.* 'tis a Calumny to ſay we damn any for differences in Opinion. Now, if the Doctor will needs tell us what Faith, and what Opinion is exactly in every Tenet, he goes beyond his ſkill, and takes on him to teach his betters. Here is enough of his 13. Section where little is ſaid, and leſs proved.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

The Doctors wrongful Charge on Catholick Doctors. His weak Exceptions againſt Ambiguity in Speech. His cauſleſs Cavils. His Faults and Miſtakes.

PAg. 152. the Doctor begins his firſt Section thus. *That in the Church of Rome, it is publickly taught by their greateſt Doctors, that it is lawful to lye, or deceive the queſtion of the Magiſtrate, to conceal their name, and tell a falſe one, to elude all examinations, and to make them inſignificant, and toothleſs, cannot be doubted,* &c. I *Anſw.* This Charge, as it is laid out, is moſt injurious. Not one amongſt us ſay's, that a lye ever is, or can be lawful in any circumſtance; it is alwayes naught, and prohibited by the Law of God, and nature. None ſay, that we may elude *all examinations of the Magiſtrate.* The Propoſition is of ſo vaſt extent (*all examinations*) that it looſes credit with ſober men. True it is, moſt grave Divines hold; that in certain caſes of danger, and other concernments, the ambiguous uſe of words, yes, and of mental reſtriction alſo, is allowable; but ever without a lye, never without juſt cauſe and Reaſon. Impious therefore were it, to make uſe of this Reſtriction, in Contracts, Leagues, Promiſes, Vowes, or Oaths, yes, and moſt blameable in ordinary Converſation. But,

If a Confeſſor be aſked by a Judge, or any body elſe

elſe whether a penitent confeſſed ſuch a Sin, (though confeſſed) doth not the light of nature tell us, the queſtion is, if poſſibly, to be eluded; or, if *preſſed on*, utterly denyed with a *No, he did not hear it?* What will the Doctor anſwer here? will he ſay, yes? He betrayes the Penitent, and Sacrilegiouſly breaks the Seal of Confeſſion. If he ſtands dumb, and ſay's nothing, S. *Auſtin lib. uno de mendacio ad Conſent. cap.* 13. *poſt medium*, rightly obſerves in a like caſe of danger, *Tacendo eum prodimus: per noſtram vel taciturnitatem homo proditur; that by ſaying nothing we do as good as diſcloſe the Secret, and tell where the concealed man lyes hid*, and if ſo; much more doth the ſpeechleſs Confeſſor in our caſe, (though he ſhakes his head twenty times) ſpeaks out too plainly the Penitents Sin.

The Doctor therefore, with his *excellent uſe of Confeſſion* in *England*, and we with ours, muſt of neceſſity find a way, not on the one Side to lye, (for this is never Lawful) and on the other, to keep the Seal of Confeſſion ſafe and inviolable. How ſhall we do this? I can argue; if holy *Jacob*, when he poſitively affirmed *Gen.* 27. 19. that he was his Fathers firſt begotten Son *Eſau*, (yet was not) told no lye, as many Fathers hold; wel may a Prieſt alſo, ~~now~~ in the caſe now propoſed, though he poſitively affirms that he heard no ſuch Sin in Confeſſion, when he heard it, ſay *no:* He heard it not. *Jacob* ſaid *yes*, that he was *Iſack's* firſt begotten, yet was not, (and as we now ſuppoſe) ſaid it without a lye; the Prieſt ſayes, *No:* he heard not ſuch a Sin (when he heard it) and this in like manner without a lye: The Parity is right every way, if *Jacob* was not a lyar. Be it how you

wil, Christ our Lord certainly spake Truth, when he told his Disciples *Joan.* 7. 8. *non ascendo*, that he did not ascend to the Feast of the *Jews*, yet, when they went he, *blessed Lord*, ascended also. Here is some ambiguity of Speech; In the vulgar translation, which I follow, (though the Greek reads οὐκ ἀναβαίνω *nondum ascendo*, and the *Arabick*, *nunc non ascendo*) and because uttered by our Saviour is wholy irreprehensible.

To clear all, I ask of our Doctor what did this *non ascendo*, spoken by eternal Truth signify? He will answer, that though the particle, *Non*, usually makes an absolute denyal (and therefore the Apostles might wel think that our Lord would not go at all to the Solemnity) yet, here it was restrained, and only denyed his visible, or manifest ascending, as may be gathered out of the ensuing words. *Non manifestè, sed quasi in occulto*; *He went, but not openly.* If this answer may pass: I argue. The words of our Saviour, *non ascendo*, *I ascend not* when he did ascend, were true, though they had a restrained sense, and only denyed the publick manner of his ascending, not known to others: *Ergo*, these words of a Priest, *Non audivi*, *I heard not such a Sin*, when he heard it in Confession, are likewise true, though they have a restrained sense and only deny the publick manner of his hearing it (in that *forum*) not known to others. A Disparity here good Doctor: perhaps, He will answer, that the Judge or Tyrant positively demands whether the Priest heard that Sin in Confession; and his saying, *No* to it, is a flat lye. By the way, had the Apostles asked our Saviour whether he would ascend to the Solemnity, and he had answered, as he did,

did, *non aſcendo*. *No*, would he have told a Lye? I am ſure *No*. Neither did he ſay an untruth, when, *Mark* 13. ſome aſked him of the day of judgement, & he returned this anſwer; *De die illo*, &c. *of that day and hour none knows, not the Angels in Heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only*. Yet, moſt certain it is that the Son of God knew of that day: which Truth the Fathers aſſerted againſt the *Arians* endeavouring to prove, out of this very Scripture, that Chriſt was not God. He knew therefore of the day of judgement, yet ſaid, he did not know, both are true; Let the Doctor unfold this double Senſe, and we have enough for our preſent purpoſe. Hence learn, that though a Tyrant poſitively aſk of a Prieſt a thouſand times whether he heard ſuch a Sin in Confeſſion, the queſtion is not of his demand, (for 'tis moſt unjuſt) but whether a Prieſt may anſwer as truly, *No*, I did not hear it, as Chriſt our Lord ſaid, *No*; *I aſcend not, I know not of the day*; Here is the queſtion. Moſt willingly would I have the Doctors anſwer, if he finds a flaw in the Parity.

Were our Doctor better verſed in Speculation, I might here ſet down the Eſſential difference between a Ly, and mental Reſtriction. In a ly men ever ſpeak againſt their mind, for, *mentiri eſt contra mentem ire*, that is, *they judge ſo, and ſpeak contrary*. In mental Reſtriction a part only of our interior Judgment (or as we ſpeak in School *Inadæquate*) is only expres'd by Exterior words, or ſignes. For example, if the Doctor preaching to his people, hath this great truth in his mind: *God is not in Heaven after a Corporeal manner*, and ſhould by accident Exteriorly ſay no more but thus much only. *God is not in Hea-*

ven: He doth not by that half Expreſſion thwart his Judgment, or ſpeak contrary to his thoughts, but only, ſaith not fully out what he thinks. And thus it is in mental Reſtriction, what is ſaid is true, though not fully ſpoken to the capacity of the Hearer. In the Ambiguous uſe of words, uſually called *Equivocation*, there is far leſs difficulty. Hence I infer (and it is an Objection of our Doctor, *pag.* 153.) that if an Adultreſs aſked whether ſhe be one, anſwers, *No*; ſhe ſpeaks no untruth, unleſs ſhe will, but only ſayes ſhe is none publickly proved; *Or in ſome ſuch like Senſe.* Next ſaith our Doctor, *if a man compelled to ſwear to take ſuch a one for Wife, he may ſecretly mean*, if *hereafter ſhe pleaſe me*; *And the ſame is of one compelled by a Thief to give him twenty Crowns*; I anſwer, No forced Oath extorted by compulſion, is an Oath for want of Freedom and Liberty; and conſequently not Obligatory. The caſe is plain, if one ſhould take the Doctors hand *per force*, and make him write thus much. All I have ſaid in my *Diſſuaſive* from *Popery* is againſt my Conſcience; Would he hold himſelf obliged to ſtand to his Writing?

After this he cites *Vaſquez*, bragging I know not of what Doctrine, and where? In 3. *Tom.* 4. *Queſt.* 93. *Art.* 5. *Dub.* 13. Anſw. *Vaſquez* with me, *Antwerp* print, 1621. hath only 4. *Articles* in his 93. *Queſtion*, and not a ſyllable in his 13. *Dubium*, of any bragging. In his 12. *Dub. Art.* 4. he treats of our preſent matter; but nothing do I find there to the Doctors purpoſe. If he hath another Edition, let him friendly tell me. *Page* 154. (ſaith he) *Diana* holds, *That to ſave a mans credit, an honeſt man who is aſhamed to beg,*

beg, may ſteal what is neceſſary. I anſwer, He deals not well with *Diana* that ſpeaks more moderately thus. *Vir honeſtus, & cui pro ratione ſui ſtatus graviſſimum, & maximum dedecus eſſet mendicare, nec poſſet alia via victum ſibi acquirere, videtur poſſe clanculum neceſſaria ſurripere,* &c. *It ſeemes that a man of credit, and to whom it would be moſt heavy, and a mighty diſgrace to beg, nor can by any other means get ſuſtenance to live* (theſe words the Doctor conceals) *it ſeemes, I ſay, that ſuch a man may ſecretly take what is neceſſary for his ſuſtenance. Secus ſi eſſet infimæ ſortis,* &c. *But this holds not in caſe he be of a low condition,* and might without a notable loſs of his honour beg, or otherwiſe find neceſſaries. *&c.* Thus *Diana,* far of from that high Senſe the Doctor ſets down. Read him in his Compendium, *Rhoan* print, 1644. *verbo furtum.* pag. 335. *n.* 18.

Page 155. the Doctor ſaith, *That it is affirmed, and was practis'd by a whole Council of Biſhops at Conſtance, that Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks: And* John Hus, *and* Hierom *of* Prague *felt the miſchief of violation of publick Faith,* &c. Anſw. An old ſtory, and as falſe as old: For, firſt, the Council never determined, *that Faith given by Eccleſiaſtical power to an Heretick, is not to be kept.* Nay, it holds it ſelf obliged to ſtand to ſuch a promiſe; Faithfully alſo complied with it in the after Councils of *Baſil,* and *Trent.* Yet more; This Council holds, that a Secular Prince or Magiſtrate after ſecurity promiſed to an Heretick, is bound to keep it, although neither the one or other can force the Church ('tis a diſtinct Tribunal) to do ſo. True it is that King *Sigiſmund* who had given a ſafe conduct to *Hus,* ſeemed at firſt

to

to feel his Condemnation; but when he perceived the obſtinacy of the man, neither relenting after his own Princely Counſel, nor yeelding to the advice of others, he did not only condeſcend to puniſh *Hus*, but exhorted the Fathers Aſſembled at *Conſtance*, to proceed ſeverely againſt him: And why? *John Hus* violated the Laws of his ſafe conduct ſhamefully, and ran away from the Council; Yet catch'd he was, and committed to Priſon, and had his condigne puniſhment; His running away made him a guilty perſon on a new ſcore, and by it loſt the priviledge of his ſafe conduct. Here you have in brief the true Story. *Spondanus* relates it, *Tom. 2. Paris print, anno* 1641. *ad annum Chriſti*, 1415. *n.* 45. *pag.* 216. and for more, ſends you to *Joannes Coclæus*, *lib.* 2. & 3. *Concerning Faith to be kept with Hereticks. Spondanus* now cited, remits you farther to *Molanus* a Doctor of *Loven*, to *Martinus Becanus*, and *Heſibertus Roſweidus*, all Learned men, and no wayes oppoſite to publick fidelity given to any.

What the Doctor hath, page 156. of the *Pope* diſpenſing in Oaths, when they hinder a greater good, ſeems to me a childiſh Objection: For, do not ſecular Princes dayly, though a man by Law deſerves death, graciouſly reprieve him, when they prudently judge it better to free ſuch a Delinquent then to have him die? Oathes diſpenſable, are not of higher concernment, then life and death.

Page 158. our Doctor quotes *Panormitanus*, *capite propoſuit*, *de conceſs. præv. n.* 20. *Saying*, *that the Pope hath power to diſpenſe in all the Lawes of God except Articles of Faith*, &c. I anſwer. If any thing be amiſs here, 'tis rather *Vincen*: Aſſertion then

Panor-

Panormitanus, and three Limitations follow it. The firſt, *Intellige, de diſpenſatione proprie ſumptâ. Underſtand the Doctrine* (ſaith Panor.) *of a Diſpenſation properly taken*; which hath more in it then the Doctor is aware of. 2. *Niſi interveniat*, &c. *Unleſs a mortal ſin intervene, or ariſe out of Gods Law.* 3. *In his quæ*, &c. *In thoſe things that are evil of their own nature, the Pope cannot diſpence.* Theſe and more the Doctor omits, though he ought to know, we are not obliged to defend every ſaying of a Canoniſt.

CHAP. XXVII.

The Doctors ſtrange way of Arguing againſt the Exemption of Clergy-men. His unjuſt dealing with Emanuel Sa. *His unworthy ſlighting the Seal of Confeſſion.*

PAge 160. Sect. 2. He tells *us of a notorious impiety own'd by us in Exempting the Clergy from the Juriſdiction of Secular Princes, both in their Eſtates and perſons*, &c. And for this our Tenet, he cites the Canon Law (after his manner unintelligibly) *Bellarm. Suarez*, and others. And what, out of this good Doctor, is the meer relating of a Doctrine, a Confutation of it? If ſo, I have here ſet down yours, and therefore confuted it; A weak way of Arguing. *Bellarmin* brings his proofs for his Exemption

emption of Clergy-men: Where are yours to the contrary? *Suarez, defenſ. fidei Cathol. lib. 4. cap. 15. per totum*, learnedly ſhews out of Ancient Councils, the Canon and Civil Law this Exemption ratified, *even in Cauſes criminal.* And not one Canon, or Council, have you in your Margent (often charged with ſuperfluous Quotations) to gainſay him. page 162. you alledge that Text of the Apoſtle, *Let every Soul be ſubject to the higher Power*; And ſo ſay we alſo good Doctor, and tell you that Clergy-men have their higher Powers, and Seculars theirs; both reſpectively owe and own obedience to their Governours. Here is all you prove. O, but S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, upon this Text: *Etiamſi Apoſtolus ſis*, &c. *Although you be an Apoſtle, an Evangeliſt, a Prophet, or whoſoever; you are to be ſubject to Supereminent Powers.* I anſwer. Every word is exactly true, but the Saint mentioneth nothing of Clergy-men liable to the Judicature of a Secular Magiſtrate; but rather the contrary: For ſaith he, *Neque enim de hoc aut illo Principe ſermo mihi nunc eſt, ſed de ipſa re. I ſpeak not of this or that Prince, but of Subjection it ſelf*; and I ſay, that every Soul is to have it; The Servant to his Maſter, the Wife to her Husband, Seculars to their Prince. Yes, and I add, Clergy-men alſo in civil Affairs, for there is not one among us who doth not profeſs with all candor, a dutiful obedience to his Prince, to his Magiſtrate, to the Laws of the Country he lives in; If he proves criminal in theſe, the Church doth not patronize him, but, when the guilt goes high, quits him, and turns him over to the ſecular Power for puniſhment. Good civil Laws therefore and Eccleſiaſtical, run ever, as it were hand in hand

hand together; both, like two eyes of the ſame body looke one way, haue the ſame end which is the peace and welfare of a kingdom: obedience to the one yeilds obedience to the other, an offence againſt the civil Law joyntly implyes an offence againſt the Eccleſiaſtical; when either Prince or Magiſtrate are wrongfuly dealt with, the Pope looks not on and laughes, but condoles with them, yes and holds himſelf, and his Lawes injured alſo. Can more be deſired, if men would ſet paſſion aſide, and ſuffer reaſon to ſay down right what is reaſonable?

Hence you may ſolve that weak objection of our Doctor page 161. *Princes* (ſaith he) *have many times felt the evil, when ſo many thouſand perſons are in their Kingdoms, and yet ſubject to a forreign power. Solve it I ſay,* for the Subjection they owe is in point of Spiritual juriſdiction only, whereunto ſecular Princes hitherto never laid claime; and with this Subjection the Civil Laws in Kingdomes ſtand ſtill in vigor obliging every Soul to a dutiful Obedience. I have ſaid it now, and 'tis moſt true; that Eccleſiaſtical, and civil Laws, (rightly, as we here ſuppoſe, conſtituted) never claſh with one another. *No*; Peace, Tranquility, and perfect Union among all, is the final aime of both; if men devoid of paſſion, would but rationally underſtand it.

The Doctors repining at the Eccleſiaſtical mens Eſtates, exempted from the juriſdiction of Secular Princes, looks (as it is) like a vain cavil; for what have theſe *as Clericks*, but their Tythes, (Tythes I think the Doctor will hold of Divine Right) and the ancient liberal Benevolence of pious Chriſtians to enrich them? (The Doctor if a Biſhop, eates yet their

bread) and theſe bleſſed Men gave their goods ſolely to the Church: Emperours and Princes liked wel of the Charity, and approved it; therefore we need not now diſpute here, *quo jure*, by what right Clergymen are exempted; it is ſufficient to ſay, that the *Donors* and Princes freed them; Yet, this Obligation follows them, as all Divines hold, that at leaſt they are bound in Charity to give what is ſuperfluous to the poor; which Charity alſo moves them to ſupply their Prince when neceſſity requires it. Thus they have anciently done, and yet comply with the like duty the whole world over. Such men, good Doctor are ſuppoſed vertuous; and believe it, vertue doth more then force. Needleſs therefore it is to wrong their priviledges, and wreſt from them with ſeverity what may be had in a ſweeter way. Truly I think, if the Clergy in *England* or Univerſities either, were forced againſt their Priviledges, and paid taxes as Secular men do every where, they would feele it a little.

However if the Doctor likes it, let him on Gods name pay his *quota*, and liſt himſelf among Seculars, for, in real Truth he is no better, his Clerkſhip will not free him.

Page 162. he cites *Emanuel Sa*, for this abominable aſſertion, *Aphoris. verbo Clericus. The rebellion of a Clergy-man againſt his Prince is not Treaſon, becauſe he is not his Princes Subject:* And ſayes, *though theſe words were left out of the* Paris *Edition, becauſe the French men endured not the Doctrine, yet they ſtill remain in the Editions of* Antwerp, *and* Collen. Anſw. I have now before me the *Antwerp Edition*, 1599. and have read exactly every Number or Section under that

that word *Clericus*, (53 in all) and therefore will boldly ſay it, that *Sa* is unworthily wronged, for he hath not through *theſe* 53. *Numbers*, a ſyllable like this Quotation of the Doctor, but rather the contrary. *A Clergy man*, ſaith he, n. 6. *carrying Arms forbid by Secular Laws, may have his Armour taken from him by the Miniſters of ſecular Juſtice.* Again n. 7. *A Clergy man taken in a crime, may be laid hold of by a ſecular Judge, and given up to the Eccleſiaſtical*, &c. And ſurely, much more may he be roughly dealt with, if catch'd in the higheſt crime, or found guilty of rebellion againſt his lawful Sovereign. I therefore tell the Doctor, ſuch a Clergy man deſerves hanging: and that not ſo much as one Aphoriſm in *Sa*, will ſave his life.

In the laſt Paragraph of this Section, page 162. and 163. our Doctor is pleaſed to ſpeak of another Iniquity (ſo he terms it) whereof our men are guilty. And what is it? *They hold*, ſaith he, *the ſeal of Confeſſion ſo highly of Divine right, and Sacred, that it cannot bee broken to ſave the lives of Princes, or the whole world.* I anſwer they ſay alſo, that to ſave the lives of Popes, of Biſhops, of Prelats or the Church from ruin the ſeal of Confeſſion (made ſecret by God and nature) cannot be violated. What miſchief then have we more by this Doctrine againſt Princes and worldly Intereſt, than againſt Popes, and the Spiritual welfare of the Church? All, God knows, are alike concerned in the danger (if any were) though the kindneſs of our Doctor is for the ſecurity of ſecular Princes only. More flattery believe it here, then good Divinity.

To treat in this place of the great ſecreſie where-

unto the ſeal of Confeſſion indiſpenſably binds us, is neither my task, nor any way requiſite. Divines have amply done it to our hand. It is enough to tell you, how unworthily the Doctor ſleights both Seal and Secreſie in the laſt lines of his Section, where he calls it *a trifling Fancy of our own.* A ſtrange word in the mouth of a Doctor, which may both juſtly work a diſtruſt in the heart of any penitent, and make confeſſion ridiculous, even among *the pious Children of the Church of* England.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Of the Doctors injurious Calumnies. Of his unjuſt Quotations.

THe Doctor, pag. 164. and laſt Section tells us, *That the whole order of Jeſuites is a great enemy to Monarchy, by ſubjecting the Dignity of Princes to the Pope, by making the Pope ſupreme Monarch of Chriſtians, and this they teach,* ſaith he, *as Catholick Doctrine,* &c. I anſwer. The calumny is ſo enormouſly great, that I wonder the Doctor trembled not to write as he hath done, and diſgrace himſelf with it: For, if ever men *immovably* ſtood for Monarchy, both in Church and Kingdomes, they *are Jeſuites.* To prove this Aſſertion, I need no more, but only to remit you to one Learned *Bellarmin* (and there is no Jeſuite gainſays him) *lib.* 1. *de Romano Pontifice, cap.*

cap. 2. where he ſhews both by the Authority of Ancient Philoſophers, and Chriſtian Writers, that Monarchy, ſimply conſidered, is a better Government then *Ariſtocracy* or *Democracy*: Farr is he off from *Calvins* ſpirit, that thought it intollerable both in Eccleſiaſtical and Secular Government. O, but they deſtroy Monarchy by ſubjecting the *Dignity of Princes to the Pope, and making him the ſupreme Monarch of Chriſtians.* I anſwer. Had the Doctor made ſome Canoniſts (leſs conſiderable in their writings) aſſerters of this Papal power, even in Politicks, he had been more moderate: But to aſcribe the Doctrine to the *whole Order of Jeſuites* runs beyond all bounds of Truth. Jeſuites in this particular hold with the other Catholick Doctors, and ſay that the Pope is the Supreme viſible Head of the Church in Spirituality, that is in Power, and juriſdiction Eccleſiaſtical: Conſequently is neither Lord, nor Monarch of the whole World, nor finally hath directly by Divine right any Temporal juriſdiction over Princes. See for this Aſſertion, *Bellar. lib.* 5. *de poteſt. pont. cap.* 2,3,4.

Whence it follows (and *Jeſuites* aſſert it) that Princes are the ſole ſupreme Lords, and Monarchs in their reſpective Dominions ſubject to none, if we conſider their Secular power, but to God only.

Princely dignity therefore ſtands unſhaken, no Pope layes claim to that Soveraignty, or meddles with it. My God! had our Proteſtant Miniſters (as it behoov'd dutiful Children) been as careful to preſerve inviolably Eccleſiaſtical Monarchy in the Church, as Popes have ever ſhewed themſelves tender Fathers to uphold the Monarchy of Princes, the World now had not ſeen what it ſees, and deplores;

I mean those woful Rents and Schisms, which these wantonizing Children have made in *Christendom*, while the good old Father looks on with a heavy heart, and bemoans their folly. Know then for certain ('tis no dispute) Protestant Ministers are the men that destroy Monarchy of Spiritual jurisdiction, erected by Almighty God in the Church (this is their crying sin, unpardonable without Repentance) whereunto Secular Princes never made claim, nor can they in Justice. Let then the Pope have still the Prerogative of Spiritual Jurisdiction over the Church ('tis his due) he seeks not for more, our quarrels are ended. And tell me I beseech you, are not Princes better secured in their Dignities by owning this Spiritual Power, as due to a Supreme Pastor, who is Vigilant for their safety, and has no little sway in the world; then to have their Princely Prerogatives called into question, debated, yes, and judged also by a knot of fickle Puritans (as changeable as the Moon) who now stand up defendants of Regal Power, now turn stiff Opponents, and arm against it: Now they Crown their Monarch, now pull the Crown off his Head. Such doings we have seen, and bewailed the Injury done to Princes. Thought, we say, is free; Every body may think safely: but I'll at present be a little bolder and speak out plainly. Had *England* in the last unfortunate Civil Wars been as it was anciently Catholick, or own'd as once it did, a due Subjection to the *Pope*. None perhaps had seen so much as a Sword drawn against our Gratious Sovereign (who now Reigns) nor his Royal Father so barbarously murthered as he was by his own Subjects. *No.* For if Ecclesiastical censures had not

stopp'd

ſtopp'd the raging fury of thoſe *Regicides*; one ſpark of Catholick Religion would have mollified ſuch hearts though made of *Adamant*; But what will ye? When both Religion is banniſhed, and Church Diſcipline is held contemptible: Paſſion will ſway corrupt Laws, make Scaffolds, draw Swords, kill Kings. and what not?

In the next place our Doctor, pag. 165, and 166. enters upon this very odious ſubject of depoſing and killing Kings, and ſayes we Catholicks are Defenders of both. *Mariana* and *Santarel* are produced by him for horrid things ſpoken. Anſw. As I hate at my heart to do ſo much as mention this impious Doctrine of killing Kings, and abhor more to approve it; So, for no provocation of any, will I ſpeak a word ('tis forbid me) of their depoſing. Though were I minded to recriminate: that one Execrable and Tragical ſhedding of our late Sovereigns blood without pitty poured out in his own Pallace, in the ſight of the Sun, and open view of the World (it yet draws ſighs from many a heart) ſpeaks loud enough of a Prince more horridly depoſed and murthered, then ever yet came to the knowledge of Chriſtians, or any *Mariana* once thought of. And who were the Actors in this Abominable Tragedy? Men of a reformed Faith (and did it not in a ſudden paſſion, but deliberately, which aggravates the crime) while Catholicks, ever loyal to their Sovereign, look'd on with weeping eyes, and heavy hearts. Who approved, who applauded that dayes ſinful work? Thoſe of the ſame bran. *John Milton* was one: witneſs his wicked Book againſt *Salmatius*, whoſe only praiſe is to ſpeak Treaſon in good Latine. What

Doctors

Doctors have we found among Catholicks since the death of our Sovereign, that either side with *Milton*, or speak a syllable in defense of those *Regicides*? not one. All unanimously cry shame upon them, curse, and anathematize the Fact, and say t'was damnable.

Now after this so crying a Sin, to hear a Doctor harp upon the far lesser faults of *Mariana* & *Santarel*, what is it but a weak and too spleniſh a Recrimination? They said ill. Be it so (if yet *Mariana* said it) their Doctrine is therefore prohibited, and lies under censure) but have they either said or done like these now mentioned? What I say is not to touch in the least any Protestant loyal to his Sovereign. *No*; but only to tell the Doctor he did not well, to rub on old Soars in others abroad, while he hath more festered *Ulcers* to look on, and Lance in some of his own Brethren at home; I say *in some*, for innumerable were Loyal, and those I touch not; Charity therefore might well have told him, that the fault of a few is never to be cast on the greater part, who were innocent and harmless.

Now concerning the Loyal fidelity both of *English* and forreign Catholicks towards their Prince and Magistrate (could I license this short Treatise to grow to a greater bulk) much might be said, though indeed there is already enough published by that learned Author of the Protestants Apology (the Book is had in *England*) printed anno 1608. where, *Tract.* 3. *Sect.* 3, 4, & 5. pag. 658, 663, 667. You shall find the Loyalty of Catholicks (if Reason, Authority and Confession of Adversaries may have place) strongly asserted. Beside other undenyable proofs; he observs page 662. that when Queen *Elizabeth* entered

entred the Throne Royal, all received her with moſt dutiful ſubmiſſion. The then Catholick Lord Archbiſhop and chancellor of England, in a publick oration perſwaded the people to acknowledg her Maieſty for their lawful Queen and Sovereign: And a like Loyal reſpect ſhe had from other Catholick Lords and Biſhops, *&c.* But was it ſo when queen Mary, that reigned before her, came to the Crown? No, ſaith my Author, open rebellion in open field (*Stow* recounts it in his *Annals*, the pages are there exactly cited) was her publick welcome (and there was more of it in her 5. Years, then in 25. of Queen *Elizabeth*) and private turbulent Spirits, (witneſs that Dagger thrown at one Preachers head at *Pauls* Croſs; and a Gun ſhot off at another) gave her no better entertainment. Parallel here the Receptions of theſe two Sovereigns, and ſay candidly, who were then forwardly ſubmiſſive, who, untowardly rebellious. Nay, ſhall I ſay more, parallel the hideous, horrid and out-crying Rebellion of ſuch as have deſerted their Ancient Faith, the whole World over, with the faults of Catholicks (for all are not faultleſs) you ſhal find as great a diſparity, as is betwixt a little Skirmiſh and a fierce fought battle; the half drawing of a Sword, and ſheathing it in the bowels of an Innocent man. See for this Aſſertion the Proteſtants Apology, *Tract* 3. *Sect.* 2. *pag.* 649. but chiefly in his Preface to the Reader, from *pag.* the 10. to the end. From this moſt Learned and Laborious Writer, I will borrow ſome few of thoſe many Inſtances he hath in that Preface to anſwer a pithleſs cavil of our Doctor, *p.* 171. Where,

A little Book in Engliſh cal'd *Jeruſalem* and *Babel*, or the Image of both Churches, printed at *London*, 1653. the 2d. Edition, will help you to make this parallel.

He dares not deny, but that ſome *Calviniſts* and warm ſpirited *Puritans*, may have been reprehenſible (*atleaſt Catholicks recriminate them in this point*) yet he gravely adds; *That indeed they borrowed theſe Doctrines from Rome, uſing their Arguments, making uſe of their Expreſſions, and purſuing their Principles.* Anſw. And is it poſſible, can a Doctor talk thus? Can ſober men give credit to his Obloquy? Pray you tell me, when the *Waldenſes* in *France*, the *Huſſites* in *Bohemia*, the *Wicleffians* in *England* (ſome make theſe men Proteſtants) ranted and vapour'd as they did, contemned Magiſtrates, raiſed up Rebellion, and acted ſo Tragically againſt their lawful Governors, &c. Did *Rome* learn them their Leſſon? did *Rome* teach them the Dotage, to contemn *Roman* Diſcipline? When that *Hector*-rampant *Ziſca* (the *Huſſites* General) after the Ravage and Violences done on his own Native Country, falling ſick commanded his ſkin to be pull'd of his dead Carkaſs, and a Drum to be made of it, which the *Huſſites* ſhould uſe afterward in Battel: Had he think ye a *Breve* from *Rome* to do this more then *Scithian* cruelty on himſelf? When *Martin Luther* Dogmatically taught, *That amongſt Chriſtians no man ought to be Magiſtrate, none Superior, and being told that he troubled the World with his new Goſpel*, &c. He returned this accurſed Anſwer. *Quereris quod per Evangelium noſtrum*, &c. *Thou complaineſt that by our Goſpel the World is become tumultuous. I anſwer: God be thanked for it, I would have it ſo, woe to me* (He might have added and to my Kate alſo) *if things were not as they are, all in tumults.* When I ſay ſuch Malice againſt *Rome*, boyled hot at his heart, and the

the filthy froth of his rage ran thus out of his mouth, did *Rome* add fuel to that flame, or make that Veſſel of iniquity to boyl as it did? *Apage Nugas.* 'Tis trifling to ſay ſo. Again, when ſneveling *Calvin* (to ſay nothing of *Zuinglius*) ſeditiouſly vented. *That Earthly Princes bereaved themſelves of Authority, if they were againſt God: and that they are unworthy to be reckon'd amongſt the number of men; that we may ſpit in their faces* (ſo this holy faced man ſpeaks) *rather then obey them.* Did *Rome* either inſtil ſuch Poyſon into his Breaſt, or lay that Venom on his pernitious Tongue? No God knows: both *Rome* and the Rhemiſh Doctors aſſert; *that Chriſtians are obliged in Conſcience to obey even Heathen Emperors. And worthy Doctor* Kelliſon, doubts not to ſay: *That Faith is not neceſſary to Juriſdiction Temporal, neither is Authority loſt by the loſs of Faith.* See theſe Authorities quoted in the Proteſtants Apology, *Tract.* 3. *Sect.* 5. *pag.* 668. Once more, and I end. When bloody *Beza* preaching at *Grenoble*, with his Sword and Piſtol, exhorted the people to ſhew their Courage and Manhood rather in butchering *Papiſts* than breaking down their Images, was it *Rome* I beſeech ye (then ſo oppoſit to Popery and Images) that armed that Gallant Combatant and gave him his Theam or Text to preach on? Was it *Rome* that depoſed that ſuffering Lady the Queen of *Scots*, our Sovereign King *James* his vertuous Mother? That depoſed *Sygiſmond* from his Kingdom in *Swedland*? The Temporal Lord of *Geneva* from his Sovereignty? The King of *Spain* from a conſiderable part in the *Low Countries*? the Emperour from many rights in *Germany*? Was it *Rome* that Licenſed thoſe Rebels in the *Netherlands*,

by publick Writings to renounce all Obedience to *Philip* their Lord and King? To ravage as they did at *Gant* and *Antwerp*, and other places? to break down Altars, overthrow Churches, murther Monks, banniſh Biſhops, make havock of all? What can the Doctor ſay to theſe unfortunate Tragedies? (though I have not told half of the doleful ſtory related in the Preface now cited) he anſwers in part well. *We reprove the men and condemn their Doctrine.* So do we alſo good Sir, in caſe either Catholick or any offend, and Unanimouſly profeſs with S. *Barnard*, *Paris* print, *anno* 1602. *Epiſt.* 170. *ad Ludovicum Regem. pag.* 1565. *Si totus orbis adverſus me Conjuraret ut quippiam molirer*, &c. *If the whole World ſhould conſpire againſt me, or move me to attempt any thing againſt my Sovereign, I would fear God and not dare to offend the King, appointed by him. For I know it is written, that who reſiſteth Power reſiſteth the Ordinance of God, and purchaſeth to himſelf damnation.* Here is our Catholick profeſſion: *Rome* both thinks and ſpeaks with us; to take off the Doctors injurious charge laid on us in this Paragraph, I have ſaid thus much, never intending to caſt the leaſt aſpertion on any Proteſtant that is Loyal to his Sovereign.

Next the Doctor quotes *Suarez lib. 6. defenſ. fidei cap. 6. Sect.* 24. (*Sa* is alſo cited and *Scribanius*, but without their places) for this aſſertion. *An excommunicat King may with impunity be depos'd or killed by any one.* Anſw. He either never read *Suarez*, or is unpardonably guilty of falſity. For *Suarez* ſaith expreſly *n.* 24. that *this very propoſition now uttered, ſimpliciter prolata falſiſſima eſt, ſimply ſpoken is moſt falſe*, and gives this Reaſon: *Excommunication*

tion alone, and nudely conſidered, impowres no body to kill the excommunicated party, nor to deprive him of his Dominions, but only debarrs him from communication with others. Rex ergo excommunicatus &c. *A King therefore excommunicated only, if the Sentence ſay no more, cannot be depoſed, and killed by his Subjects or any,* ſaith *Suarez.* 'Tis true he adds a limitation, which, becauſe I think the Doctor well underſtands not, I omit to ſay more of. A ſufficient vindication it is to tel you, that the propoſition here ſet down for *Suarez* his doctrin is none of his, and utterly falſe in it ſelf.

Page 167. after *Suarez* he hath a bout with *Bellarmin* for a ſtrange propoſition, and thus it is *lib. 4. de Rom. Pont.* cap. 5. *Secundo. Si autem Papa erraret* &c. *If the Pope ſhould err by commanding vice, or forbidding vertue, the Church were obliged to believe, that vices were good, and vertues evil, unleſs it would ſin againſt Conſcience.* They are the very words of *Bellarmin,* ſaith our Doctor. *Anſw.* they are ſo, but moſt unworthily weigh'd out of their circumſtances; and as they ſtand here alone ſeem to aſſert I know not what miſchief or error; whereas moſt certainly in the context of *Bellarmin,* they have an excellent Senſe, and prove that neither Pope nor Church can err. Obſerve I beſeech you, *Bell. in his* ℣. *above, Ac ut rem totam,* ſaith, *it cannot be that the Pope err by commanding any Vice; as Uſury: or, forbidding any vertue,* as *reſtitution: &c.* This he proves firſt ℣ *quod autem, becauſe the Church would not be called holy, if he did ſo.* 2. Becauſe, *if the Pope taught ſuch a doctrine, the Church would err in Faith; for Catholick Faith aſſures us, that vertue is good, and Vice*

is

is evil. Now ſaith *Bellarmin*, (and here are the *miſconſtrued words* of our Doctor) *if the Pope ſhould err, by commanding Vice, and forbidding Vertue, the whole Church would be bound to believe amiſs*; which you ſee does not aſſert any error in Pope or Church, but plainly excludes both, and renders this Senſe. Moſt impious it is, to think that the whole Church is bound to believe that Vice is good, and Vertue naught: therefore, impious it is to judge that the Pope can err in commanding Vice, and forbidding Vertue: As if one ſhould ſay, wicked it is, to hold that the whole body of Chriſtianity believes amiſs; therefore it is impious to hold that God commands us to believe ſo. In a word; the whole diſcourſe of *Bellarmin* is grounded on this Principle, that the *Pope, as Pope*, cannot err; and by deſtroying it (ſaith this learned Authour) you may ſee what follows, an Univerſal Error or Misbelief in the Catholick Church. This is moſt exactly *Bellarmins* Senſe: and for my Aſſertion, I appeal to the judgment of every Ingenuous Reader: And therefore cannot but pitty the Doctor, and moſt of our Proteſtants too, who poor men (utterly deſtitute of all Antiquity) will rather play at *ſmall Game* then *ſit out*: piddle they muſt, and glean in our Authours: faults, if fancied, muſt be found: words wreſted, Sence turn'd out of Sentences: The leaſt hint ſerves them to miſconſtrue all. Thus they proceed, though it coſt them dear, an Eternal loſs of their credit.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIX.

Of our Doctors failing in History. Of his blaming Popes that are blameleſs. A word of his Concluſion.

OUr Doctor having now wronged *Suarez*, and *Bellarm.* ſets fiercely againſt *Popes*, and ſpeaks of their wickedneſs alſo; but handles the matter ſo confuſedly that no Reader can be the wiſer for any Story he tells us. He neither names Pope, nor quotes Authour for what he ſayes, but begins thus, pag. 167. *All the World knows what the* Pope *did to King* Childerick *of* France: *He depos'd him and put* Pipin *in his place.* Anſw. I think the Doctor knows not this Story very well (therefore all the World 'tis like knows it not) which he diſpatches in a word, and runs ſlightly over. However you have it largely in *Scipion Dupleix* the Kings Counſeller, *Tom.* 1. intituled. *Memoires des Gaules, Paris print*, 1627. *pag. chiefly*, 282. *Les Francois ont recourſ au Pape Zacharie*, &c. where you ſhall read that the French men themſelves *tous les Seigneurs all the Nobles*, ſaith *Dupleix*, *page* 283. *finding the great inabilities of* Childerick, *and unfitneſs to govern a Kingdome, ſtood for* Pipin, *petitioned the Pope upon weighty Reaſons to diſpenſe in their Oath of Fidelity made to* Childerick; *the Pope condeſcended*, but ſaith this Author page 286. *ſi aucuns*, &c. *if any of the ancient Chronicles have attributed this great change to the Pope, they have writ both ignorantly and barbarouſly:* In a word, the French men

men did it themſelves; nor had they, (as *Dupleix* affirms in his title page 285.) any neceſſity at all to have had any recourſe to the Pope for depoſing *Childerick*. To take away all cavil, I rather cite a French Authour, both Counſeller, and Hiſtoriographer to the King of *France*, then any other. Concerning the differences between *Pope Boniface the* 8. and *Philip le Bell*, you have a whole Book ſet forth by a French Authour not named, nor too great a friend to the *Pope*: The Title is. *Hiſtoire du differend d'entre le Pape*, &c. *Paris* print, 1655. Where you ſhall find no little Animoſity in *Philip*, and a paternal Condeſcendency in *Boniface*, euer ready to comply with that Prince. Tedious it would be to tell the whole Story.

The Doctor goes on. *They were Popes of Rome that armed the Son againſt the Father the Emperour* Henry *the* 4th.; *the Son fought againſt him, took him priſoner*, &c. Anſw. An infinite patience is neceſſary to hear a Doctor talk as this does. Moſt juſtly may we ſay here, *the whole World knows*, what a man *Henry* the 4th. was, *an Heretick, a Sacrilegious wretch, one given to Sodomy*, ſaith *Stephanus Alberſtatenſis* in his Letter to *Walram Biſhop*, *which Dodechinus* relates in his Appendix to *Marianus Scotus*, *anno* 1090. page 460. *A light headed Fellow, and raſh, of no Counſel, mighty bold, and of a diſſolute life, who ſet the Biſhopricks of* Germany *to ſale*, &c. ſaith, Even good *John Calvin*, *lib.* 4. *inſtit. cap.* 11. §. 13. his own pious and worthy Kinſman; *Otho Friſingenſis*, ſaith *lib.* 7. *cap.* 11. *That he was promoted, potenter magis, quam juſte, more by Power then Juſtice, or honeſt Dealing.* Theſe truths ſuppoſed which no Hiſto-

hiſtorian queſtions, (excpt one *lying Benno*, ſo *Gretſer* cals him *tomo 2. in his Apol. for Greg. the 7. p.* 218. what is to be done with ſuch a Prince? muſt he revel it out? run on in his lewdneſs? ruin the Church? deſtroy Kingdomes, injure Princes without reſtraint, or Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure? Let the Doctor ſay candidly, whether ſuch an ungratious Son of the Church may be tolerated, without being curb'd at all, to violate, or rather to tear out the very bowels of that Mother that begot him, and made him Chriſtian? Nothing can be anſwer'd with probability, but that the Church has power to check ſuch inſolences. And,

To ſilence the Doctors groundleſs complaint, hear in a word how it was done: *Marianus Scotus* is my Authour, *lib. 3. Cron. Ætat. 6. ad annum*, 1075. *page: chiefly* 454. *Franckfort print*, 1613. Where he firſt relates the Kings wickedneſs, then adds. *Hæc & his ſimilia nefanda & inandita Henrici Regis flagitia, videntes & audientes fieri Catholici viri*, &c. *Catholick men, conſtituted at that time in the Church, ſeeing, and hearing of ſuch enormous Crimes committed by King* Henry, *were carried on with zeal (like another* Helias) *for the Houſe of* Iſrael, *and therefore ſent Meſſengers to Pope* Alexander, *and as well by Letter, as word of mouth with ſighs and grief, made their grievances known*, &c. *Alexander* dying, *Gregory* the 7th. ſucceeded him. *Iſte querimonijs, & clamoribus Catholicorum juſtis adverſum Henricum, & ſcelerum immanitatem auditis, zelo Dei accenſus*, &c. *This Pope* Gregory *having heard the juſt complaints, the loud clamours of Catholicks againſt* Henry *and his outragious proceedings, moved with zeal of*

God, declared him Excommunicated, chiefly for his Simony. Thus *Marianus*. Where you see that the Pope depos'd him not, but only declared him an Excommunicate person; and this at the importunate Instances, and just Complaints of the *German* Princes: He that desires to know more of this unfortunate King, let him read *Baronius* chiefly, *ad annum*, 1080. *Tom.* 11. where, *pag.* 532. *Antwerp* print, 1608. *lit. D.* He shall find how justly that heavy Censure of the Church fell upon him; how he was vilified by his own Children; forced by them out of his Kingdom, and died in misery. *It was God*, saith Baronius, *that shew'd his Judgment on him; (though late) dum filios in patrem statuit esse carnifices acerbissimos suæ sententiæ executores, while he made his own Sons to be Torturers of their Father, and revengers of his just Sentence.* Our Doctor therefore both cavils, and calumniats while he talks of *Popes arming Sons against the Father*, &c. And to take off more cavils, most willingly would I have him to name that Pope (and quote his Authour) that made *Charles the 5. and Francis the first of France take Arms against other Princes.* I love not, good Doctor, this running on in darkness: Produce your Authours. An answer is ready. Yet,

Omit I cannot to say a word, of *Francis Dandulus whom* (saith our Doctor) *being Duke of Venice, the Pope bound with Chains, and fed him as Dogs are fed with bones, and scraps under his Table.* Answ. It would make one sick to hear this tattle. Where read we, for Gods sake, that the Pope chain'd *Dandulus*? where, that he fed him like a Dog, or cast him bones and scraps? where, that *Dandulus* was then Duke of *Venice*?

Venice? All is coyn'd by the Doctor, who, as he tels his tale, makes the Pope a Beast: Whereas, God knows, the ſtory is quite contrary, and Briefly thus.

The *Venetians* had by their wrongs and violences highly offended Pope Clement the 5. and for a long time ſlighted his cenſures. At laſt (more wiſe) they ſought forpardon, as *Spondanus* recounts *ad annum* 1310. *num.* 5. *Tom.* 1. *pag.* 518.

This good man therefore, *Francis Dandulus* (no Duke then, but of the Doctors making) yet, of note and nobility among the States, preſs'd them with might and main to a due Submiſſion. And to gain pardon for their inſolencies, on his own free accord, (compelled by no Pope) he ſacrificed his honor, and did as ſtrange an Act of humility as perhaps is read in Story. *Sabellicus*, an exact writer of the *Venetian* affaires relates it (*Tom.* 2. *Baſil print. Ennead.* 9. *lib.* 7 *pag.* 791. in this manner. *Eranciſcus Dandulus illuſtri exemplo privatæ pietatis in patriam, publicæ in religionem, catenâ ferreâ collo injectâ, ad ejus menſam tam diu proſtratus jacuit* &c. *Francis Dandulus by a rare example of ſpecial piety towards his Country, and publick for Religion, having caſt an iron Chain about his neck, went to the Popes table, and lay there proſtrat ſo long. Donec, expugnatâ Clementis irâ,* &c. *Til, by force of his vertue, he vanquiſhed* Clements *anger, and cancelled the black ignominious note, which lay on his Country; whence it is,* ſaith *Sabellicus, that he was afterward called by the name of Dog; yet,* (witneſs *Spondanus*) was welcom'd home with the applauſe of all, and ſome years after made Prince in *John*'s place that dyed. Here is a difference between the Doctors ſtory and mine; mine hath nothing of ſcraps

or bones, or of the Popes feeding, and chaining *Dandulus*, &c. Pray you tell me, if our Miniſters in *England*, wearied out with their Schiſm, and Hereſie (higher crimes then the *Venetians* were guilty of) became, at laſt, ſeriouſly penitent for both, and to ſatisfie how earneſtly they ſeek for pardon, ſhould ſend up the Doctor to follow the cauſe, and obtain pardon at *Rome*: Yet more, if the Doctor like a good Patriot, to effect what he comes for, ſhould on his own free choice, humble himſelf as *Dandulus* did; throw a Chain about his neck, fall proſtrate at the *Popes* Table, *&c.* Will any man ſay in juſtice and conſcience that the *Pope* chained him, or fed him like a Dog with ſcraps? Here is the right ſtory, if good Authours wrong us not.

What he next hints at, is indeed a known thing of our King *Henry* the 2. Briefly. This Prince both ſinned and repented; his ſin in ſhedding of that bleſſed Martyrs blood, S. *Thomas* of *Canterbury* was great; And, his ſorrowful repentance for the fact, was admirable and praiſe worthy. As all deplore the ſin, ſo they make the King renowned for his pious Repentance, which God afterward bleſſed with a happy death. A fault then he did, none can doubt of it; yet like a vertuous Prince ſubmitted to any puniſhment, nay, ſought for more then was inflicted. But, I know not how, our Doctor hath a rare gift to aggravate a puniſhment, if the *Pope* hath a hand in it, and to ſay nothing of the fault: No. That muſt be concealed. So it is; The child is corrected by an indulgent Father, and complains of his whipping, but never tells you why he felt the Rod, or what he did amiſs. Had the Doctor dealt ingenuouſly; he

ſhould

ſhould (where he ends with this ſcornful *Ironia*) *ſuch was the piety of the Fathers in Chriſtendom*, firſt have ſaid. Such were the ſins of Princes, and laid out as well the faults, as the puniſhment. Beſides, ſuppoſe (which yet is not proved) that a few, among many *Popes*, did amiſs, or tranſgreſſed by too much ſeverity; muſt therefore Popedom be decryed, and all *Popes* made odious? An open injuſtice it is, good Doctor to revile all, whether *Popes* or *Princes*, becauſe ſome only have offended.

Page 168. He tells us of a ſtrange paradox that *Pope Clement* the 5th. vented in the Council of *Vienna*, *making the right of Kings dependant on him* (which is an untruth, their Temporal rights depend not on him) and the Doctor for this Aſſertion of *Clement*, cites not one Authour. *Page* 169. He talks of *Pope Boniface the* 8th.; *owning himſelf not only Lord of France, but of all the World.* And who affirms this? *Papirius Maſſonus*, ſaith the Doctor: And cites in his Margent, *Verb. Bonif.* 8. Anſw. This blind and unſkilful way in quoting of Authours (held all along by our Doctor) is more then intollerable. Know, I beſeech you, that *Maſſonus* writ 4. Books of Annals, wherein he deſcribes the Exploits of *Frenchmen*; I have his 2. Edition, *Paris print.* 1578. Should not the Doctor think you (had he ever ſeen theſe Annalls) have pointed to ſome one of theſe 4. *Books*? Without leaving us in darkneſs, with only the word *Boniface* 8. which is no Title, but only found in the Index. However to unbeguile the Reader, by help of the Index, I have peruſed what *Maſſonus* hath of *Pope Boniface*, *lib* 3. *pag.* 337. he deſcribes his manners, and ſays, *He was Learned, but withal crafty*, &c.

Not

Not a syllable there of *Boniface His owning himself Lord of France, or the World. lib. 8. pag. 351.* He tells us, *That after* Philip le Bell *had oppressed the Clergy, with heavy Taxes, to maintain a War against* England, *the Pope disliked it, and therefore forbad the same; Withal, willed* Philip *not to oppress Churchmen with such Exactions.* The King obeyed not; *Wherenpon,* saith Masson, *Boniface sent him a sharp Letter,* and said, *that all Kings were subject to the Pope and Church, (understand in Ecclesiastical Affairs,* for the whole Context bears no other Sence,) *and that he had offended against both* Equity *and* Order of Law, *by seizing on the Clergies Goods, conferring Ecclesiastical Dignities,* &c. What is here, good Reader of *Boniface owning* himself Lord of *France,* and the whole World also? When neither *France* nor the World, are not so much as mentioned; Nor any word found relating to the Temporal Jurisdiction of Princes.

The Doctor saith more: *That all the Jesuites Order makes the Pope Lord of the World, and that the maintenance of it is the Subject matter of their new Vow of Obedience, to advance his Grandeur.* Answ. Few Jesuites will read this vast lashing out of all Reason, without smiling a little at the Doctor, and may, most justly *Vow,* that he is yet to learn, what both their Doctrine, and Institution is. I say therefore, his Assertions are utterly untrue. The Order of Jesuites never made the Pope Lord of the World; never thought it; never taught it; (see *Bellarmin* cited above:) and their 4th *Vow of Obedience* No more advances his temporal Grandeur, then the Doctors talk hurts his Spiritual jurisdiction, that is, just nothing at all. What he next cites out of some *Canonists,*

is

is neither the Doctrine of the Church, nor good Divinity.

Page 170. he tels a fearful ſtory of *Sixtus Quintus, who in an Oration ſolemnly had before the Cardinals* 11. *September Anno* 1589. *commended the Monk, James Clement, that kil'd Henry the* 3. *of France.* I Anſwer, firſt. This very accuſation, as the Doctor words it, proves nothing. For *Sixtus* might commend *Clement* that kil'd the King, though he prais'd him not *for that impious Fact.* One may commend Doctor *Taylor* for ſome good parts, yet hold him moſt blamable for his other faults, of deceit and errors. Again, who can avouch with certainty, that *Sixtus* made ſuch an Oration? *Boucher*, ſaith the Doctor and one or two more: And is this a handſome way of quoting Authors? *John Boucher* a Doctor of *Sorbon*, *Canon*, and *Archdeacon* of *Tornay*, wrot ſeveral treatiſes and books apart: the *Ark of the Teſtament in folio*; *The Converſion of Henry the fourth*; *The myſtical crown of Princes*; Sermons &c, and muſt I wander among all theſe directed by one poor word *Boucher*, to find *Sixtus his Oration* aſſerted authentick? 3. Suppoſe, *Boucher*, or *Ancelin* avouch it authentick, we are never the wiſer, unleſs we have *Sixtus* his expreſs words, which the Doctor cavils at: And were that done, it will be yet doubted whether all be not a forged buſineſs, becauſe graver Authors, as *Spondanus* and *Dupleix*, who relate at large the ſtory of *Sixtus* and *Henry*, mention nothing of this Oration. See *Spond. Tom.* 3. ad annum 1590. and *Dupleix*, *Tom.* 4. *Hiſtoire de Henri*, 3. Laſtly, *Cardinal Bellarmin Apologia pro reſpons. Ad lib. cui titulus Triplici nodo*, &c. ſaith moſt poſitively.

Nulla

Nulla apud nos sixti Quinti extat oratio, & quæ ab Adversariis &c. *There is no such Oration of Sixtus extant here; and, that which is published by Enemies, although it deserves no credit, may yet have a commodious Explication, as is farther read in our answer pag.* 70, 71, 72. What is this but to say in plain English that the Oration is *Spurious*, and though it were as bad as some Adversaries make it, yet it may be without difficulty Explicated.

Our Doctor, page 171. having done with his *Dissuasive, ends, with an Use of Exhortation to Persuade and Exhort all, as they desire to be saved, in the day of the Lord Jesus, to decline from these horrid Doctrines.* (those he means which he charges on us) And so do I good Reader also, without half the stirr the Doctor has made about them; for they are all Monsters, of his own making. Horrid it is, and Monstrous to Assert, as he doth; *That we are Enemies to Monarchy, that we profess not a due Obedience to Princes, that the whole Order of Jesuites owns the* Pope *Lord of the World*, &c. Ignorance begot these Doctrines; Fancy mishaped them in some bodies Brain; Passion brought them forth; out they are as you see in print, ugly, and ill-favoured; We utterly dis-own them, and say they are false. The naked Truth I have declared, and therefore *exhort all, that love Christ Jesus*, ro decline from the Doctors horrid mistakes. After the rest of his wordy *paræneſis* (not worth taking notice of) for a *farwel*, he closes up all with a *Behold, we set before you Life and Death, Blessing and Cursing, Safety and Danger*, &c. I answer. He hath done so indeed; but the danger (God knows) lies where he least thinks, in his

his own unpardonable Errors, miſ-leading ſimple Souls to Perdition: God prevent that he does not too late bewail his inconſiderate venting of them; I need not preach to the Doctor, he believes I hope already, that Death (and that Eternal) will be the miſerable portion of all thoſe Seducers who do not timely repent, and make themſelves Members of the Catholick Church: God give the Doctor grace to conſider of this ſeriouſly and ſuddenly; Into this Houſe of God (as I have heard) he was once ready to enter; but neglecting the Grace that call'd him, he is now as you ſee, ſo unfortunate as to diſwade others from entering alſo; With what ſting of Conſcience he hath done this evil, God only knows; done it is, and I ſuſpect the worſt. But the great Day of our Lord Jeſus, when both he and I muſt be heard to juſtifie our ſelves, without *farther diſpute*, will lay open, Whether, he hath wrong'd his Conſcience in writing this *Diſſuaſive*, or, I without cauſe have accuſed him of Errors. To this Impartial Judge, and moſt juſt Tribunal, I appeal for Sentence: And ſhall in the *Interim*, earneſtly pray, as behoves a Chriſtian, and friendly Adverſary, for Doctor *Taylor's* Converſion.

FINIS.

FINIS.

THE CONTENTS.

QVotations faulty in D. Taylors Preface to the Reader.

Chap. I. Of the Doctors ungrounded Diſcourſe, to the wrongful charge on Catholicks for making new Articles of Faith. page 8

II. The Doctors Quotations not true. His Errors concerning the Index Expurgatorius. His ill dealing with Sixtus Senenſis. page 15

III. The Doctors Quotations not right: prayer for the dead proves a Purgatory. page 22

IV. The Doctors Quotations ſtill amiſs, S. Auſtin, and Otho Friſingenſis are abuſed by him. page 27

V. The Doctors Cavils againſt Tranſubſtantiation. His falſe quotations. His Impertinent queſtions and weak Arguments. page 37

VI. Of the Doctors weak Arguments againſt Communion under one kind; Of his ſlight impugning prayer in an unknown language. Of his ill quotations. page 43

VII. Of the Doctors Cavils againſt Images. Of Antiquity approving their Veneration. Of the Doctors ill quotations. page 47

VIII. Of the Drs confus'd quotations. Of Veneration due to the Holy Croſs. Of picturing the ſacred Trinity. p. 54

IX. Of the Popes Supremacy: Of the Doctors Cavils againſt it.

it. Of his false quotations. page 62

X. *Of S.* Gregory's *refusing the Title of Universal Bishop. Of Fathers asserting the Pope to be Supreme Pastor. Of the Doctors faulty quotations.* page 72

XI. *Of the Doctors harsh Doctrine concerning speedy Repentance after Sin. Of his mistakes, and wronging Authors.* page 83

XII. *Of the Doctors Cavils against Contrition and Confession. Of his wronging the Council of* Trent *and Catholick Authors.* page 89

XIII. *The sum of our Doctors discourse concerning Indulgences. His two mistakes are discovered. His Objections answered.* page 100

XIV. *A word more of Indulgences. Of the Drs. mistakes in quoting Authors. Whether the prayer of a sinner avails him. Of the Doctors harsh doctrine.* page 106

XV. *Of the Doctors weak argument against one satisfying for another. Of his new Divinity, that the habit of sin is sin. Of his worse doctrine that all sins are mortal. Of his mistakes, and charging on Catholicks what they hold not.* page 114

XVI. *Divines prudently follow in innumerable cases a probable Opinion. Of the Doctors exceptions against it. Of his mistakes.* page 119

XVII. *How the Doctor wrongs both the Canon Law and Catholick Authours. Of his quotations unworthily corrupted.* page 123

XVIII. *Of attention necessary in prayer. One may pray that perfectly understands not the words of prayer. The Doctor quotes amiss, and abuseth* Suarez. page 137

XIX. *The Doctor yet holds on in quoting Authours amiss. His errors are discovered.* page 142

XX. *Of recourse had by the living to the Saints in Hea-*

ven

vin for temporal Neceſſities. 8. Aulin warrants this practice. 8. Gregory Niſſen approves it. Of Miracles done in our Age. page 147

XXI. Of Saints Canoniz'd excepted againſt by the Doctor. Of his untrue quotations. Of his miſtake concerning the multitude of Holy dayes. page 154

XXII. Adjuration of Devils approv'd by the Ancient Church and Authority of Fathers. The Doctor cannot except againſt our Catholick Exorciſms. page 158

XXIII. Objections againſt Exorciſms ſolved. Of the Doctors miſtaken quotations. page 166

XXIV. The bleſſing of Water prov'd by Irrefragable Authority. Of miracles done by holy Water. No proof againſt it. page 172

XXV. Of the Doctors dark Divinity. His doctrine concerning the charging of Catholicks with Idolatry, weigh'd by Mr. Thorndikes juſt Weights. The Doctor is prov'd a Schiſmatick by the Meaſure Mr. Thorndike makes of one. Of the Doctors want of Charity towards his Anceſtors, and all Catholicks. page 177

XXVI. The Doctors wrongful charge on Catholick Dr. His weak exceptions againſt Ambignity in Speech. His cauſleſs Cavils. His faults and miſtakes. page 184

XXVII. The Doctors ſtrange way of arguing againſt the Exemption of Clergy-men. His unjuſt dealing with Emanuel Sa in charging him with this ſaying, the Rebellion of a Clergy man againſt his Prince is not Treaſon. His unworthy ſlighting the Seal of Confeſſion. page 191

XXVIII. Of the Doctors injurious Calumnies againſt Catholicks, charging them with Horrid doctrines againſt Kings and Monarchy which they diſown and abominate,

The known carriages of Catholicks towards Princes, compared with the rebellious practices of Protestants. The Catholicks have ever been found most Loyal and Obedient to their Kings. Of his unjust quotations. page 196

XXIX. *Of our Doctors failing in History. Of his blaming Popes that are blameless. A word of his Conclusion.* page 207

Advertisement.

THE Edition of the *Dissuasive* made use of in this Treatise is that Reprinted at *London* for *Thomas Johnson*, at the *Key* in *Pauls Church-yard*, 1684. in Quarto. There may seem a defect in this Treatise by reason of a mistake of the Printer, who using two Presses, began with one in the later part of the Copy, and not computing right how many sheets the fore part of the Copy would make, the numbers affix'd to the Pages follow not in due order, but after page 130. immediately follows page 137. However the Reader may please to take notice that the Treatise is intire.

Faults Escaped.	Thus Amended.
In the Epistle. *emendandum* unluckily	Read *emendandum*. read *unlucky*.
PAge 8. Line 1. Tough	Read Though.
p. 9. l. 3. Authority	r. antiquity.
p. 11. l. 33.	blot out 5.
p. 17. l. 19. their	r. this.
p. 21. l. 33. Cluadius	r. *Claudius*.
p. 34. l. 10. living. l. 20. ἐκεῖσθαι	r. sining. r. ἐκεῖσθαι.
l. 25. καθάρσιος	r. καθάρσεως.
p. 35. l. 7. Com.	r. Tom.
p. 42. l. 25. doubty	r. Doughty.
P. 45. l. 5. p. 46. l. 28. rights	bl. in. r. rites.
P. 47. l. 8. rights	r. rites.
P. 50. marg. Athanius. l. 15. adorabant	r. Athanasius. r. adorabat.
p. 61. l. 11. delating	r. relating.
p. 87. l. 26. said? l. 29. more?	point. said. p. more;
p. 67. l. 10. S. G. p. 68. l. 15. leaves	r. S. C. s. leave
p. 69. l. 20. was? p. 70. l. 9. their. l. 24. damnable	p. was. r. there. r. damageable.
p. 91. l. 27. primative. p. 74. l. 5. the. ibid. then	r. primat. r. thy. r. thou.
p. 88. l. 27. sin. p. 95. l. 7. supar	r. sin. r. supra.
P. 102. l. 17. thsy. p. 107. l. 29. another,	r. they. po. Another?
p. 127. l. 4. *fecerit*. p. 138. l. 18. even.	r. fecerit. r. ever.
P. 141. l. ult. 68. p. 162. l. 30. incredulty.	r. 67. r. incredulity
P. 171. l. 15. saying. [redacted] l. 3. unhollow.	p. saying? r. unhallow
p. 174. l. 24. raging.	r. rageing.
p. 209. l. 29. *inaudita*	r. *inaudita*.

LIBRARY OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY NEW YORK